MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

VOLUME XL

1925

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

BALTIMORE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REVIEWS

CORRESPONDENCE

BRIEF MENTION

NECROLOGY

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

This publication is devoted to linguistic and literary research and to æsthetic and philosophic criticism in the domain of English, German, and the related Germanic Languages; and of French, Italian, Spanish, and the other Languages of the Romance Group. Its purpose is also to promote sound methods in the teaching of the Modern Languages and Literatures.

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is $5.00 for the United States and Mexico; Canada $5.25 and $5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union.

Contributors and Publishers will please address matter for the English Department of the *Notes* to James W. Bright; for the German Department to William Kurrelmeyer; for the French Department to H. Carrington Lancaster; for the Italian and Spanish Departments to Gustav Gruenbaum. Other matter may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief. The address of all the editors is Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

PREPARATION OF COPY

All copy should be in typewritten form.

Underscore (for italics) all titles of books, periodicals, poems, plays and other separately published compositions.

Use numerals in designating foot-notes, and number foot-notes in unbroken sequence.

Use roman numerals for volume-reference, set off by a comma before a following page-reference.

Volume XL JANUARY, 1925 Number 1

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, Editor-in-Chief

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

CONTENTS

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year — Single Copy (Current) Sixty-five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XL JANUARY, 1925 NUMBER 1

CHARACTERS IN MEDIEVAL LITERATURE

There has been little discussion concerning characterization in Medieval literature.[1] The average critic would probably assume that, with some few exceptions, it is negligible; and he would probably add that the great lack was in realism.[2] Chaucer's Canterbury pilgrims stand out in sharp contrast to their background, only to be explained with reference to their author's genius. In studying the seventeenth century "character," Mr. Henry Morley

[1] Studies that I have found useful include the following: "The Character Types in the Old French *Chansons de Geste*," by W. W. Comfort, *PMLA*. XXI, 279 ff.; "Character in the 'Matter of England' Romances," by H. L. Creek, *JEGP*. X, 429 ff., 585 ff.; "The Middle English Ideal of Personal Beauty, as found in the Metrical Romances, Chronicles, and Legends of the XIII, XIV, and XV Centuries," by W. C. Curry, Baltimore, 1916; and "Die Charakterzeichnung bei Chaucer," by E. Meyer, Halle, 1913, Morsbach's *Studien*, XLVIII.

[2] A discriminating statement is that of Charles S. Baldwin in his *Introtroduction to English Medieval Literature*, London and N. Y., 1914, p. 65: "The heroes of epic, more like the real men that we know, are more distinct from one another, Achilles from Ulysses, Beowulf from Hrothgar. The heroes of romance, somewhat indifferently endowed with all manly virtues, are all very much alike, Lancelot like Gawain, Gareth like Percival." This opinion is at the bottom of much of the discussion in Ker's *Epic and Romance*. Speaking of the romances, Professor Saintsbury has observed: "The motive-and-character-interest is rarely utilised as it might be," *The English Novel*, London, 1913, p. 24. It would be easy to add other quotations to the same point. The justice of this position is, however, seriously open to question. There are many realistic characters in romance, if we use "romance" in a broad sense, and if we take into account their action,—from Guinivere and Iseult of the White Hands to Grim, Gamelyn, Sir Kay, and the butcher who appears in *Octavian*. The tradition of the different figures is occasionally obscured by changes and additions; but to the man in the Middle Ages the heroes were identified by certain generally fixed traits. This is not the place to take up the question of motivation.

observed that, "The first and best sequence of 'Characters' in English Literature is the series of sketches of the Pilgrims in the Prologue to Chaucer's 'Canterbury Tales.' The characters are so varied as to unite in representing the whole character of English life in Chaucer's day, and they are written upon one plan, each with suggestion of the outward body and its dress as well as of the mind within. But Chaucer owed nothing to Theophrastus.[3] In his Character Writing he drew all from nature with his own good wit."[4] In other words Chaucer's technique is unexplained by anything in the literature of his own times.

There is hardly room for argument about the fact that the General Prologue of the Canterbury Tales drew considerably upon nature; that even local and personal allusions were introduced to an astonishing degree,—perhaps in such cases as the Shipman's boat, the "Maudeleyn," and the very mormal on the Cook's shin. But it is now just as well known that the poet culled some flowers from the works of his contemporaries, in the fashion of his day; and we have been convincingly taught that the Prioress owes some of her worldliness to La Vielle in the *Roman de la Rose,* even as the Parson derived some of his piety from the *Roman de Carité.* Sometimes indeed the most baldly realistic material comes from the treatises of the physiognomists, unless we may suspect that many of these echoes are due to the coincidence that in both cases the details were taken from real life. The fact that each pilgrim is the best of his kind, or the extreme of his type, may possibly be due to the mannerism of Medieval romantic literature, whereby each hero is the bravest, each heroine the fairest.[5] But while the

[3] There is no evidence that he knew the Characters. He used the fragment of the *Liber de Nuptiis* which is preserved in Jerome.

[4] *Character Writings of the Seventeenth Century,* London, 1891, p. 17.

[5] It would be futile to list many instances, but in a short time I have collected the following: *Havelok,* ed. Skeat and Sisam, Oxford, 1915, p. 36; *Morte Arthure,* ed. Björkman, Heidelberg, 1915, ll. 75-76; *Roman de Troie,* ed. Constans, Paris, 1904, *SATF.,* I, 265, ll. 5100 ff.; *Partonope of Blois,* ed. Bödtker, London 1912, *EETS. ES.,* p. 4; Chrétien's *Cligès,* ed. Foerster, Halle, 1921, ll. 447 ff.; the *Thornton Romances,* ed. Halliwell, 1894, Camden Society, p. 88, ll. 10 ff.; p. 122, ll. 29-30; p. 177, ll. 13 ff.; Ritson, *Romances,* London, 1802, I, p. 1, ll. 11-12; p. 171, l. 35; II, p. 1, ll. 10; p. 91, ll. 10; p. 156, ll. 8; p. 205, l. 30; pp. 249 ff., ll. 39 ff.; III, p. 3, l. 39; p. 95, ll. 38; p. 146; l. 30; Weber, *Romances,* Edinburgh, 1810, I, p. 331, ll. 13-14;

subject-matter may be thus accounted for, Chaucer's "characters" remain unique in *form*,—as extensive but very compact summaries of descriptive detail and of traits of character, in which the use of what is concrete and realistic is striking. What I wish to show now is: (1) that such descriptions are found in the early treatises on vice and virtue, and in the allegories; and (2) that in this way realism may have found its way into literary art in general in this period.

Medieval romance, it is true, furnishes a variety of portrayal which catalogues the hero's or heroine's features by the inventory method.[6] In this kind of literature, however, characterization is usually effected dramatically,—a method which is more appropriate and more subtle. Even the portraits are sometimes given in action, so to speak, as when we read of the appearance of Queen Olympias riding through the town in *Kyng Alisaunder*.[7] Descriptions which combine character and appearance are found only sporadically; those which have much length are rare.[8] Furthermore the specific

II, p. 4, ll. 31; p. 282, ll. 32; p. 371, l. 50; III, p. 159, ll. 45-46. This feature is well known to students of romance, and therefore the present search, I confess, has not been systematic. For other notes to a similar effect, see Creek, *op. cit.*, p. 444, note 24; and (on the fifteenth century limitation to this formula) Curry, *op. cit.*, p. 11. For the pure superlative, the variant "fairer [braver] none might be" sometimes occurs; this I have included in my list.

[6] Familiar instances are the description of Briseida in Dares, that of the ghost in the *Awntyrs off Arthure*, and that of the Green Knight in *Gawayne and the Grene Knight*. One remarkable form appears in Chrétien's *Cligès*, ll. 811 ff. This method goes back at least to the Alexandrian Greek romance-writers: see Ogle, *MLN.*, XXVII, 241. For such use of detail in Chaucer see Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 2-3; and note instances in other poets referred to in *Anglia*, XXXIII, 440 ff.

[7] Weber, *Romances*, I, pp. 12 ff., ll. 155 ff. Other descriptions given through action are as follows: *Erec*, ed. Foerster, Halle, 1909, ll. 1593-1672; *Roman de Troie*, I, pp. 62 ff., ll. 1230 (1218) ff. Another and equally skillful type of description is that given through the effect on an observer: see, e. g., Calogrenant's description of Sir Kay, *Yvain*, ed. Foerster, 1913, ll. 113 ff.; cf. *Erec*, ll. 1484 ff.

[8] By all odds the most remarkable collection that I have noticed is that of the gallery of portraits in the *Roman de Troie*, I, pp. 263 ff. Note, e. g., that of Troilus, p. 281, ll. 5393 (5373) ff.:

> Troïlus fu beaus a merveille;
> Chiere ot riant, face vermeille,

data which are afforded with regard to character are frequently conventional and vague. Take, for instance, what the romance of *Octavian* gives us:

> He was a man of grete fauour,
> He leuyd in yoye and greet honour,
> And doughty was in dede.
> In turnament and yn fyght
> Yn the worlde was not a bettur knyght
> Then he was vndur wede:
> Octavyan hys name hyght,
> He was a man of moche myght,
> And bolde at euery nede.[9]

Legends and other religious narrative contribute no steadier tra-

---

> Cler vis apert, le front plenier:
> Mout covint bien a chevalier.
> Cheveus ot blonz, mout avenanz,
> E par nature reluisanz,
> Ieuz vairs e pleins de gaieté.
> Onc ne fu rien de lor beauté. Etc.

Of characterization in the romances, Curry remarks: "Tho this tendency to develop character at the expense of personal description is felt most strongly in the chronicles, yet it prevails also to a large extent in the romances as well," *op. cit.*, p. 5. His examples are, in general, very brief. He has already said that in the romances "the one-, two-, and three-line descriptions are by far most common, yet more detailed presentations of beauty are sometimes given," *ibid.*, p. 4.

[9] Ed. Sarrazin, Heilbronn, 1885, *Altengl. Bibl.*, p. 64, ll. 16-24. Cf. the description of Jason, *Roman de Troie*, I, pp. 38 ll. 727 (715)ff.:

> Icist Eson un fil aveit
> Qui Jason apelez esteit
> De grant beauté e de grant pris
> E de grant sen, si com jo truis.
> Grant force aveit e grant vertu,
> Par maint regne fu coneü;
> Mout fu corteis e genz e proz
> E mout esteit amez de toz;
> Mout por demenot grant noblece
> E mout amot gloire e largece;
> Trop ert de lui grant reparlance,
> E tant aveit fait dès enfance
> Que mout ert coneüz sis nons
> Par terres e par regions.

See also the *Roman de Thèbes*, ed. Constans, Paris, 1890, I, pp. 279 ff., ll. 5717 ff.

dition in this respect;[10] and there was really nowhere in these fields any motive which inevitably led the author to describe and characterize his figures in the somewhat deliberate manner of Chaucer's Prologue.

In the treatises on vice and virtue and in the allegories there was a necessity to do just this,—to list qualities and traits in order to set forth a familiar human type. These documents were forced to reflect real life in order to point their moral. Here the descriptions of personified Avarice, Envy, Sloth, and the like, anticipate Chaucer's portraits and the seventeenth century "character" in a remarkable way.

The original suggestion for such a treatment may have been found in a Biblical discourse like that on Charity in First Corinthians, thirteen: "Charity suffereth long and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up," etc. What is reasonably the most primitive form is hardly more than a definition, of which an example appears in the Kentish or Southeastern *Vices and Virtues*:—

Temperantia is an oðer hali mihte, ðe cann swiðe michel scile and mæðe of alle kennes þinge. Hie ne wile ðoliȝen non ouerdon þing; an oðer halue, ne to litel ne to michel. Se ðe hire ræd hlesten wile, ne scal he noðer eten to michel, ne drinken to michel, ne to litel; ne he ne scall resten ne slapen to michel, ne to litel; ne he ne scal to michel bien spekende, ne to michel swigende; ne he ne scal

[10] Cf., however, the following from the *South English Legendary*, ed. Horstmann, London, 1887, p. 368, ll. 61 ff.:

> Ake þus ȝe him mouwe i-knowe: ȝif ȝe him i-seo:
> he is swiþe long of bodi: of riȝt fair fourme and freo,
> Opriȝt he geoth and euene i-novȝ: and swiþe ȝwijȝt is his bleo,
> his her is broun and swiþe crips: non ne mai cripsore beo,
> Muchele eyȝene and euene nose: i-streiȝt a-doun a-long,
> his berd is long and sid i-nouȝ: and sum-del hor among;
> In a ȝwijȝt Golioun he geth: he nath cloþes non mo. Etc.

In this there is no characterization; pure characterization appears in the portrait of Daniel in the *Vices and Virtues*, ed. Holthausen, *EETS.* LXXXIX, 1888, p. 43:

> Naðelæs, ouer alle þing he luuede under gode abstinenciam, castitatem, þat is, wiðhealdnesse of metes and of drenches, and of alles kennes galnesses. Ne mihte him naðer befelen. Swa swa he was on kynges hyrde lange ifedd and ȝefostred, leuere him was to eten benen and pesen and swilche unorne metes, and ðat water to drinken, ðanne him ware ðo derewurðe sondes ðe comen fro ðe kynge. Etc.

to prudeliche bien iscredd, ne to unorneliche, ne he ne scal bien to glad, ne to sori.[11]

A more advanced form is found in the *Ancren Riwle,* in the famous passage regarding flatterers and backbiters:—

Iherest tu hu Salomon euened bacbitare to stinginde neddre? So heo is sikerliche. Heo is neddre kundel: *ant* þeo þet speked vuel bihinden berd atter in hire tunge. Þe vikelare ablent þene mon *ant* put him preon in eien, *þet* he mid vikeled. Þe bacbitare cheowed ofte monnes fleschs ine uridawes, *ant* beked mid his blake bile o cwike charoines ase þe þet is þes deofles corbin of helle. Yet wolde he teteren *ant* pileken, mid his bile, roted stinkinde fleshs, as is reafnes kunde: þet is, ȝif he uolde siggen non vuel bi non oðer bute bi þeo *þet* rotied and stinked al ine fulðe of hore sunnen, hit were ȝet þe lesse sunne; auh lihted upon cwike fleschs, tetered *ant* tolimed hit . . . . He is to ȝiuer reafen *ant* to bold mid alle. Etc.[12]

This is but a small part of the whole account.

[11] *Op. cit.*, p. 107. See also the description of Honestas, p. 133; cf. Providentia, p. 103. For another definition see *Jacob's Well*, ed. Brandeis, *EETS.* cxv, London, 1900, pp. 69 ff. [MS. about 1440]; and the *Lay Folk's Catechism*, *EETS.* cxviii, London, 1901, pp. 88 ff. Cf. Chaucer's Parson's Tale, *Complete Works*, ed. Skeat, Oxford, 1900, iv, p. 616, Lachesse.

[12] Ed. Morton, Camden Soc., lvii, 1853, pp. 82 ff. For the flatterers, see p. 86:

Uikelares beoð þreo kunnes. Þe uorme beoð vuele inouh: þe oðre þauh beoð wurse: þe þridde ȝet beoð alre wurste. Þe uorme, ȝif a mon is god, preiseð hine biuoren himself, *ant* makeð hine, inouh reðe, ȝet betere þen he beo, *ant* ȝif he seið wel, oðer deð wel, he hit heueð to heie up mid ouerpreisunge *ant* herunge. Þe oðer is ȝif a mon is vuel, *ant* seið *ant* deð so much mis *þet* hit beo so open sunne *þet* he hit ne mei nonesweis allelunge wiðsiggen: he þauh, biuoren þe monne sulf makeð his vuel lesse. "Nis hit nout nu, he seið, so ouer vuel ase me hit makeð. Nert tu nout, i þisse þinge, þe uorme, ne þe laste." Etc. "Sie ist die erste nicht"! Cf. also the backbiter, p. 88:

Weorpeð adun þet heaueð, *ant* foþ on uor te sike er he owiht sigge: *ant* makeð drupie chere: bisaumpleð longe abuten uor te beon þe betere ileued. Etc.

For other material, see: the proud, p. 210; the wrathful, p. 212; the sluggard, p. 212; the covetous, p. 214; the lecherous, p. 216. Miss Hope Allen, who regards the Middle English version as a translation, puts the date much earlier than preceding scholars have: "several years after 1134," possibly in the reign of Stephen, *PMLA.* xxxiii, 509 ff. In relation to this should be consulted "The Original Language of the *Ancren Riwle,*" by D. M. E. Dymes, *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association,* ix, Oxford, 1924, pp. 31 ff.

The finished Character, however, is less symbolic than this. It depends more on observation, and strives more definitely to reproduce what is recognizable human nature. I shall give only a few examples out of many, the first being again taken from the *Ancren Riwle*:—

Þe ȝiure glutun is þes feondes manciple. Uor he stikeð euer iðe celere, oðer iðe kuchene. His heorte is iðe disches: his þouht is al iðe neppe: his lif iðe tunne: his soule iðe crocke. Kumeð forð biuoren his Louerde bismitted *ant* bismeoruwed, a disch ine his one hond, *ant* a scoale in his oðer: maðeleð mid wordes, *ant* wigeleð ase uordrunken mon þet haueð i-munt to uallen: bihalt his greate wombe, *ant* te ueond lauhweð þet he to bersteð.[13]

Here is something of the flavor of Bishop Hall's collection. Another example may be found in Dan Michel's *Ayenbite of Inwyt,* that of the Envious Man:—

Þe enuious ne may ysy þet guod of oþren nanmore þanne þe oule oþer þe calouwe mous þe briȝtnesse of þe zonne. . . . Þe herte of þe enuious ys enuenymed and suo miswent. þet he ne may oþre manne guod yzy þet hit him ne uorþingþ wyþinne þe herte. and demþ kueadliche. and þet he yziȝþ oþer þet he yherþ: nimþ hit to kueade wytte and of al makeþ his harm . . . . Efterward þanne þe enuious y-herþ oþer yzyþ oþremanne kued huet þet hit by oþer kuead of bodye ase dyaþ oþer ziknesse. oþer kuead of auenture [hap.] ase pouerté oþer aduersité. oþer kuead gostlich ase huanne he yherþ þet zome þet me hyelde guode men: ys y-blamed of zome vice. Of þelliche þinges him gledeþ ine his herte. Etc.[14]

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 214.

[14] Ed. Morris, *EETS.* xxiii, 1866, pp. 27 ff. Cf. the French of Frére Lorens, ff. xvii (I have used the fifteenth century MS. deposited in the Harvard Library):

Car li enuieux ne puet voir le bien dautruy. ne que la suete. ne la chauue ansuyȝ la clarte du soleil. . . . Le cuer de lenuieux est si enuenimeȝ et si bestorneȝ que il ne puet a aultrui bien voir. quil ne len poise dedens le cuer et juge mauueisement ce que il voit et ce *que* il oit, et prant tousiours en mauueis sens et de tout fait son domage. Tant ha on cuer de lenuieux de pensees enuenimees de fauls jugemens que en ne le porroit nombrer. Etc., f. xvii vo.

The *Ayenbite* offers several good Characters: see the glutton, pp. 50 ff.—

God him hat ueste: þe wombe zayþ 'þou ne sselt ac et longe and a-trayt.' God him hat be þe morȝen arise: þe wombe zayþ 'þo ne sselt ich am to uol me behoueþ to slepe.' Etc.

See p. 56 also. For flatterers see pp. 61 ff. Note on pp. 135 ff. the Character of a virtue, the Truly Mild:

Efterward þe zoþe milde worþssipeþ god and him byt mildeliche. þet

A third (on the same subject for the sake of comparison) may be taken from *Handlyng Synne* by Robert of Brunne:—

> Enuyus man is so ful of susspecyun
> þat euyl hym þenkeþ al, as a felun.
> who-so kan knowe þe properte,
> Enuyus man may lyknyd be
> To þe Iawnes, þe whyche ys a pyne
> þat men mow se yn mennys yne.
> þe ye þat ys ful of Iawnes,
> Alle þenkeþ hym ȝelogh yn hys auys:
> So hyt fareþ on hys party,
> Hys þoght ys euer ful of enuye.
> Enuyus men, euyl þey sowe;
> þat men telle hem, to euyl þey trowe;
> ȝyf þey se þat one doth more
> Enuyus þan angreþ sore.[15]

It continues at much greater length to expound the weaknesses of Envious.

There is considerable skill in some of these descriptions. They are found with even more detail and artistry in the allegories, where, although the same ideas are often presented, the realism

his to zigge mid zoþe teares þet comeþ of godes grace and mid riȝtuolle oninge of herte. Vor hit him þingþ þet he is ase þet child þet is echedaye beuore his maistre and naȝt can his lessoun. Etc.

Virtues are sometimes characterized, but the material is notably less realistic. Vice is always easier to make realistic, as one can observe by studying the product of the schools of realism, and by noting the great sinners in literature, from Hagan in the *Nibelungen Lied*, Ganelon, and Milton's Satan, down through the literature of roguery and the cult of the criminal to Don Juan, Faust, and other modern instances.

[15] Ed. Furnivall, *EETS*. CXIX, 1901; CXXIII, 1903. P. 135, ll. 3971-84. Cf. the French from the *Manuel*, ll. 3913 ff.:

> Tant est plein de suspeciun
> Qe mal quide partut li felun. Etc.

Note also Backbytere, *Handlyng Synne*, ll. 4169 ff.; the Slothful Rich, 4241 ff. From the latter I shall quote a few lines, 4283 ff.:

> To hym þat kalled, he spekeþ stoutly
> 'What deuyl! why haþ þe prest swych hy?
> Byd hym þat he abyde algate;
> Hym dar nat syng ȝyt ouer late.'
> For hym shal so Goddys seruyse abyde
> Tyl hyt be passed ouer þe tyde. Etc.

Cf. the French, ll. 4127 ff.

is still further developed. Whether the writers actually went to the treatises, and borrowed the form and the material for their own purposes, it would be difficult to prove; but there seems to be a relationship of some kind. In the allegories it was necessary to give tangible substance to the personified abstractions,[16] and here was a ready means. The *Roman de la Rose* offers examples of this development: I shall quote one or two from the Middle English translation which was, for a long time, attributed to Chaucer. Here the Lover sees many images on the Garden Wall, portraits of the Sins displayed for the edification of the passerby.

> Another image set saugh I
> Next Coveityse faste by,
> And she was cleped Avarice
> Ful foul in peynting was that vice;
> Ful sad and caytif was she eek,
> And also grene as any leek.
> So yvel hewed was hir colour,
> Hir semed have lived in langour.
> She was lyk thing for hungre deed,
> That ladde hir lyfe only by breed
> Kneden with eisel strong and egre;
> And therto she was lene and megre.

[16] The allegories sometimes fail to distinguish between the personified abstraction (in the form of a type) and the symbolic figure that bestows the quality of the abstraction. Note the symbolic element in the following description of Envy from the *De Planctu Naturae*, translated by Moffatt, Yale Studies, XXXVI, N. Y., 1908, pp. 71 ff.:

Now from Pride is born a daughter . . . She is Envy, and by the gnawing rust of continual detraction she destroys the minds of men. She is the worm because of whose bite health of mind sickens and falls into disease, soundness of mind rots into decay, rest of mind is abandoned for trouble. She is the guest who, after being lodged in her host's guest-chamber, pulls down the hospitable shelter. Etc.

For the Latin see Migne's *Patr. Lat.*, CCX, 468. Cf. the portrayal of Nature, Moffatt, pp. 5 ff. This same confusion is found in the Characters in Deguileville's *Pilgrimage of the Life of Man.* See the edition of Furnivall, *EETS. ES.* LXXXIII, Envy, pp. 400 ff., ll. 14821; Treason, pp. 404, ll. 14981 ff., etc. Some of the best Characters are those of Glotonye, pp. 348, ll. 12815 ff.; and Flattery, pp. 395, ll. 14645 ff. For the French see *Le Pelerinage de Vie Humaine*, ed. Stürzinger, Roxburghe Club, London, 1893, Flattery, ll. 8105; Gluttony, ll. 10320, etc. Or see the *Romant des Trois Pelerinaiges*, Paris, c. 1500, Glotonye, ff. XLIIIJ vo. (corrected from LIIIJ); *Flaterie*, f. LIJ ro. etc. For the symbol, see *Le Testament de Jean de Meung, R. de la Rose*, ed. Méon, Paris, 1814, IV, 90 (luxury).

And she was clad ful povrely,
Al in an old torn courtepy,
As she were al with dogges torn. Etc.[17]

Of the picture of Envy we read that she:

Never lough
Nor never wel in herte ferde
But-if she outher saugh or herde
Som greet mischaunce, or greet disese.
No-thing may so moch hir plese
As mischef and misaventure;
Or whan she seeth discomfiture
Upon any worthy man falle,
Than lyketh hir ful wel withalle.

She had a strange way of looking—she looked across, or squinted; she never looked anyone straight in the face, but shut one eye for disdain, etc., etc.[18] We may compare the corresponding figure in *Piers Plowman.* Here Envy:

As pale as a pelet. in a palesye he semede,
I-clothed in a caurimauri. I couthe him not discreue;
A kertil and a courtepy. a knyf be his syde;
Ichaue a neihȝebor me neih. I haue anuyȝed him ofte,
Ablamed him be-hynde his bak. to bringe him in disclaundre,
And peired him bi my pouwer. i-punissched him ful ofte,
Bi-lowen him to lordes. to make him leose seluer,
I-don his frendes ben his fon. with my false tonge;
His grase and his good hap. greueth me ful sore.
. . . .
Whon I mette him in the market. that I most hate,
Ich heilede him as hendely. as I his frend weore. Etc.[19]

Still more striking than this, in the same poem, is the Character of Religion:—

Ac now is Religioun a ryder. a rowmer bi stretes,
A leder of louedayes. and a lond-bugger,
A priker on a palfray. fro manere to manere,
An heep of houndes at his ers. as he a lord were.

---

[17] Skeat, *Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer,* I, Oxford, 1899, p. 102, ll. 207 ff.

[18] *Ibid.,* I, pp. 103 ff., ll. 248 ff. Here also are Hatred, ll. 147 ff.; Villainy, ll. 166 ff.; Covetousness, ll. 181 ff.; Sorrow, ll. 301 ff.; etc. The French is quoted at the foot of each page.

[19] Ed. Skeat, Oxford, 1886, I, pp. 134 ff., A v. 61-79, 82-3; cf. B. v. 76 ff.

And but if his knaue knele. that shal his cuppe brynge,
He loureth on hym and axeth hym. who tauȝte hym curteisye? [20]

In the instances cited there is sometimes a dramatic quality, sometimes a bit of quoted speech. It is only necessary to set them going with personal names and freer action in order to have something like the human comedy of the Canterbury Tales. In their revelation of contemporary life they show the frank self-criticism of the period. I shall quote one more example, this time at length, to show how close these Characters are to the types which serve the purposes of fiction. This is from Gower's *Confessio Amantis*:—

The proude vice of veine gloire
Remembreth noght of purgatoire,
Hise worldes joyes ben so grete,
Him thenkth of hevene no beyete;
This lives Pompe is al his pes:
Yit schal he deie natheles,
And thereof thenkth he bot a lite,
For al his lust is to delite
In newe thinges, proude and veine,
Als ferforth as he mai atteigne.
I trowe, if that he myhte make
His body newe, he wolde take
A newe forme and leve his olde:
For what thing that he mai beholde,
The which to comun us is strange,
Anon his olde guise change
He wole and falle therupon,
Lich unto the Camelion,
Which upon every sondri hewe
That he beholt he moste newe
His colour, and thus unavised
Fulofte time he stant desguised.
Mor jolif than the brid in Maii
He makth him evere freissh and gay,
And doth al his array desguise,
So that of him the newe guise
Of lusty folk alle othre take.
And ek he can carolles make,
Rondeal, balade, and virelai.
And with all this, if that he may

[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 308, B x. 306 ff. Here too are Avarice, B v. 188 ff.; Wrath, C vii. 103 ff.; Lechery, C vii. 170 ff.; etc.

Of love gete him avantage,
Anon he wext of his corage
So overglad, that of his ende
He thenkth ther is no deth comende:
For he hath thanne at alle tide
Of love such a maner pride,
Him thenkth his joie is endeles.[21]

There is a suggestion of Chaucer's Squire in the latter part of this description. Gower sets forth at great length many other figures: Hypocrisy, Inobedience, Surquedrie, Avauntaunce, Cheste, Detraction, etc.,[22] and all of them rich in vivid detail.

Here is the material for an unexpected chapter in the history of fiction. In the sixteenth century, realistic satire developed to the point where it could be moulded into the Characters of Hall, Overbury, Earle, and others, of the century following. Hall's first sequence, it is interesting to remember, was his *Vices and Virtues.* When such figures were combined with drama in the pages of the *Spectator,* a long step was taken in the advance toward the modern novel. There were other contributions, to be sure, such as that of Defoe's journalistic genius for a "story." But the great run of romance hitherto had shown an extravagant need for the precise news of real life which the Character offered. All this is well known; what is not so well known is the interesting parallel which is found in Medieval conditions. It can be carried into detail: the early satires show a leaning toward realism; the treatises

[21] *Complete Works*, ed. Macaulay, II, Oxford, 1901, *the English Works*, pp. 108 ff., lib. I, ll. 2681 ff.

[22] See Hypocrisy, *ibid.*, pp. 52 ff., lib. I, ll. 594 ff.; Inobedience, pp. 69 ff., lib. I, 1235 ff.; etc. For as much material again, see the *Mirour de l'Omme, Complete Works*, I, Oxford, 1899, pp. 15 ff., ll. 1069 ff. The Confession *motif* with numerous Characters is found in the *Cursor Mundi*, ed. Morris, *EETS.*, LVII, LIX, LXII, ll. 28076 ff. (pride); 28156 ff. (envy); etc. It is also used in *Piers Plowman* in a similar way, ed. Skeat, I, pp. 130 ff., B v. 63 ff.; C vii. 14 ff. The use of a dramatic quality in representing the Sins, which appears in Deguileville and in *Piers Plowman,* is found also in an early form in the *Middle English Treatise on the Ten Commandments,* [N. Car.] *Studies in Philol.*, VI, 1910, p. 22:—

Therwith cometh in pride & settith him in þe middel of alle. and þan he beginneth to boste & ruson him self of many þinges þat he hath not. ne kowde. & alle saien it is sooth.

Then couetise herith þat. & þan cometh he in boldely. Etc.

create Characters, and these are carried further in the allegories; Chaucer uses the Characters dramatically. Chaucer's pilgrims meet at the Inn, corresponding to "the Club" which meets at the Coffee House; both groups are described in detail at the beginning; they all move about, converse, and appear in action; they all represent varied classes of the people.

Chaucer's pilgrims are nearly always more individual than the Characters, but that is true also of the Club. Most of them, however, show that element of the typical which is essential to a "broad appeal." [23] The Knight has been to all places where it is necessary that a typical knight should go; the Franklin is the typical Epicurean, and the Monk is your perfect hunting parson of a later age. The man of the fourteenth century would have recognized many an old friend here, with, however, just the proper touch—a peire of bedes, a garment, or a feature—to combine the individual with the typical. A high watermark in the expression of both at the same time is found in such a passage as that describing the Friar:—

> For thogh a widwe hadde noght a sho
> So plesaunt was his 'In principio,'
> Yet wolde he have a ferthing er he wente. A 253-255.

That the typical quality is not obscured in these portraits is shown by the fact that the pilgrims have been thought to embody the seven deadly sins. Such criticism has, in this way at least, a grain of truth. I feel confident, nevertheless, that the members of "the Club" could be analyzed in the same way.

But this parallel must not be worked too hard. For his own part Chaucer may have drawn on the literature of France and Italy for precise suggestions as to his technique. He may even have utilized hints received from the satires of Juvenal and Horace to an even greater degree than we now have any reason to suppose. Yet the tradition that I have outlined remains a likely course, broadening as it did in the many allegories of the Court of Love, which Chaucer knew so well. Through the treatises and the allegories, perhaps, art in general obtained one more "contact with

[23] See Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 6 ff.; 32 ff.

life," and here again, as so often happens to be the case, art became indebted to morality.[24]

HOWARD R. PATCH.

Smith College.

---

[24] The origin and development of the discourses on vice and virtue may not be discussed in a note like this. It is impossible here to do more than suggest the extent of the material, which was obviously considerable. But it is safe to say that the beginnings were ancient. On Envy, for example, we find in the sermons ascribed to St. Ambrose such an account as the following:

De invidia quoque odium, susurratio, detractio, exsultatio in adversis proximi, afflictio autem in prosperis ejus propagatur. . . . Qui itaque invidet vel odit, non alium priusquam se ipsum occidit: qui susurrat et detrahit, prius suas quam aliorum radices evellit: qui exsultat in adversis proximi, et affligitur in prosperis ejus, alieno se primum gladio petit. Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, XVII, col. 756. Cf. col. 757:—

. . . . Charitas scilicet quae fundamentum est omnium virtutum et bonorum: quae non invidet, sed congaudet: non odit, sed diligit: non susurrat, sed objurgat, non detrahit, sed arguit: non de adversis proximi gaudet, sed mœrit, etc. Note the other sins discussed here as well. Cf. St. Jerome, Migne, XXVI, col. 417:

Invidia vero aliena felicitate torquetur, et in duplicem scinditur passionem: cum aut ipse est aliquid in eo, in quo alium esse non vult: aut alium esse videns meliorem, dolet se ei non esse consimilem. Etc. Cf. St. Augustine, Migne, XXXIX, 1769. St. Augustine gives the Character of an envious man as follows:—

Attendite quod ille invidus est, qui alienum bonum suum facit: et dum facere non potest, clamat per vicos et plateas, et velut canis latrat et ardet; sed primo se ipsum, more phoenicis, occidit. Etc. Migne, XL, 1264. For other treatments of the subject, see St. Petrus Chrysologus, Migne, LII, 194 ff.; Hugo de St. Victor, *ibid.*, CLXXVI, 1000; and on "cupidus" Innocent III, *De Contemptu Mundi*, *ibid.*, CCXVII, 717 ff. In the last of these, note the Character material in col. 719: ".Quis unquam cupidus primo fuit voto contentus," etc. Hugo de St. Victor gives the family trees of the vices and virtues, Migne, CLXXVI, after col. 1006; cf. Frère Lorens and the *Ayenbite*.

NEW LIGHT ON RENAN

The most intelligent man of the nineteenth century (accepting Faguet's estimate) a prey to misgivings lest he be unequal to an examination for *la licence,* this is one of the intimate, and piquant, glimpses of Renan offered in the recently published addition to his Correspondence.[1] Similarly we find him letting himself be exploited by his employer at the boarding-school because he is too shy to call the latter a rascal (p. 16); and he writes to his sister of his lack of physical courage: "Tu connais mon caractère: quand il s'agit de lutter contre une force brute, je suis d'une prudence qui approche de la timidité" (p. 142).

There had been previous evidence of this tendency, and it constituted a serious blemish, in the opinion of one of the prominent Renan critics, Maurice Barrès (that is to say in the revised opinion of Barrès, who himself had earlier been known as Mademoiselle Renan). In 1914, on the occasion of the death of Ernest Psichari, the author of *le Roman de l'Energie Nationale* remarked upon the lack of heroism in the work of Renan: "J'y cherchais vainement un élan tout direct et tout franc, le goût du risque physique, et j'écartais avec impatience un excès de précaution. Or voici que cet enfant guerrier est apparu pour justifier son grand-père."[2] With due respect for the sacrifice of the grandson, such purification is unnecessary. The present letters prove it. Renan was anything but physically agressive, and nothing in his upbringing under the eyes of his mother and his sister[3] and in the cloister of a catholic seminary was calculated to offset his native gentleness. But he had a moral fibre which enabled him in a crisis completely to dominate his physical reticence, as is shown here at the point where he determines to rescue his sister from the dangers of the Poland of 1848: "Il est vrai que par ma mine et mon inexpérience je puis à peine m'appeler un homme. Mais je suis ton frère, cela me donnera de la force."[4] And in general such timidity as

[1] *Nouvelles Lettres Intimes, 1846-1850,* Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 1923, p. 9.

[2] *L'Ame Française et la Guerre,* II, *les Saints de la France,* Paris, 1915. pp. 71-72.

[3] Cf. Henriette's warning about the perils of railway travel, p. 508.

[4] P. 147. Cf. the energy of "je pars, sans plus rien attendre," p. 155.

he had was the defect of a virtue, a consequence of his intelligence; unlike men of a more downright and trenchant nature (and more *simplistes*) he was so sensitive to the limits of human understanding, so aware of the dimensions of the universe, that he was temperamentally disposed to personal humility.

This was a part of the critical poise admirably illustrated in these letters. How vigorously he objects to rigid systems, to a Manichean doctrine which crudely cleaves between the good and the bad, to fixed ideas that are bound to become false ideas![5] One of the most intimate and intense of the letters is that in which Renan writes of a rare but violent disagreement with his sister on the subject of liberalism, and remarks:

> Henriette, il te manque une certaine impartialité, une certaine largeur, ou tolérance, qui fait à toute chose sa part, qui ne s'attache à rien exclusivement, qui n'est d'aucun parti (tu es d'un parti, toi), mais qui voit dans chacune une face de vérité à côté d'une part d'erreur, qui n'a pour personne ni exclusion ni haine, parce qu'elle voit la nécessité de tous ces mouvements divers, et le droit qu'a chacun d'eux par la part de vérité qu'il possède, de faire son apparition dans le monde (p. 294).

The result of this non-partisanship is not oscillation. It will be remembered that during this period Renan began the composition of *l'Avenir de la Science,* published a half-century later with the prefatory statement that he found his youthful convictions essentially unchanged. The letters contain innumerable significant references to that work,[6] and they breathe the determination which is to characterize all of Renan's intellectual life, and the robust faith in his own vision of scholarship. " Mentir à ma pensée et taire des résultats fins, nouveaux, intéressants, pour répéter d'insupportables vieilleries me sera toujours impossible . . . " (p. 62). " Il faut marcher, marcher à tout prix, sans regarder ce qu'on brise, et ce qu'on renverse." (Pp. 307 ff.) This is not ruthlessness; it is the resolution of a proud spirit who begins by conquering himself, who completes his Hebrew Grammar in a dreary room, his fingers almost too chilled to write, heartened only by Berthelot,

[5] Pp. 66-68, 193-194, 279, 291.

[6] The first mention of *l'Avenir de la Science*, is in the letter of May 9, 1848 (p. 176). One of the most curious references is that in a letter of August, 1849, where he voices the fear lest if the publication of the book is postponed for a year it may no longer correspond to his views (p. 355).

and who finds the ultimate satisfaction chiefly in having exercised his moral powers, in having made himself terminate a difficult task, *malgré tout, malgré moi-même* (p. 82).

Back of this lies a deep seriousness. Sainte-Beuve found something sacerdotal in Renan; there is much evidence on this point here and of such a nature as to give pause to those who like Henri Massis[7] and Barrès[8] cry dilettante. Witness his objection to the mere curiosity of certain critics and of the middle class that did not understand the cosmic significance of scholarship. What is M. Cousin in the last analysis but a *curieux de philosophie,* M. Villemain but a *curieux de littérature?* These man have a delicate discernment not likely to be equalled, but deep convictions are lacking. "Ce sont des surfaces qui se superposent, en se reflétant la lumière par mille jeux divers et agréables. Percez au-delà, vous trouverez le vide du scepticisme" (p. 221). Compare his strictures, no doubt severe, concerning Naples and southern Italy, the country of pleasure, nothing else. "Jamais une noble pensée n'a germé sur ce sol; jamais on ne s'est préoccupé du beau idéal et du vrai. . . Pays ignoble, pays de plaisir; la jouissance étouffe l'art, comme elle étouffe la beauté morale. Pourquoi ces rudes efforts, cette poursuite acharnée? *cogliamo la rosa,* c'est bien plus facile. . . . Ce n'est pas là ma manière; ce pays excite en moi une grande réaction morale. . . " (pp. 406 f.). This is remote from Anatole France's "quand la route est fleurie ne demandez pas où elle mène." Renan's attitude found in letters written in his twenties proves nothing directly concerning the mood of his full maturity, but it shows impressively what is the fundamental nature of the man, and it is in complete consonance with the tone—how sacerdotal!—of the 1890 preface of *l'Avenir de la Science.*

The earlier collection of letters to Henriette, it has been contended (by Barrès again), lacked a certain deep piety, contained no marks of Renan's having experienced, when facing the issue of allegiance to the Church, *une angoisse religieuse.* "Ce n'est nullement une crise religieuse qu'il traversait dans les années 1843, 44 et 45. Ce sont des inquiétudes de vocation et, pour parler net, de

[7] Cf. *la Revue Universelle,* 1er mars, 15 fév., 1er avril 1923, on the "universal concupiscence" of Renan.

[8] Cf. his *Discours* at the Renan Centennial, in *le Temps,* 1er mars 1923.

carrière." [9] A problem in domestic economy! (*Id.*, p. 52). No mystic accent! [10]

This is savage criticism, but it is not intended for the moment to attempt an exact appraisal of it; our subject is the content of the new letters.

They show beyond question that Renan was eager about his career; he dwells upon *mon avenir,* he proposes to have the right people interested, to make the necessary acquaintances; the tone at these points is not sordid but somewhat unexpectedly sophisticated (pp. 37, 69, 115, 366). Shall we raise a deprecatory hand and say that this was merely the prudence (allied to personal humility, to timidity) of a discriminating spirit? This is a part of it. There is also undoubtedly a problem in domestic economy here, inevitable in the case of an impecunious and high-minded youth who feels he has too long been a financial burden to his family, notably to his self-sacrificing sister.

Is there then no mystic accent in these new letters? Not if, with Barrès, we identify such a quantity with an orthodox catholicism. There is no sign of any yearning for the renounced doctrine, no suggestion of nostalgia, and once we see, as Barrès maintains, that Renan was inclined to think of his *crise de conscience* principally in terms of the effect upon his mother (p. 109). It is obvious that Renan was serenely detached from orthodoxy. Yet he remains an intensely religious man. Why, he cries, does not modern philosophy recognize the eternal law that humanity is religious! (p. 382). He pledges allegiance to the believers.[11] The most striking and significant passage is that in which he voices his sympathy with the spiritual aspirations of the Italian monks met at Monte Cassino:

Quel types admirables de résignation douce, de délicatesse morale, de culture intellectuelle, j'ai rencontrés sous ces capuchons de

[9] Barrès, *Taine et Renan, pages perdues*, Paris, 1922, p. 51.

[10] *Id.*, p. 53. How different, says Lemaître, in a similar connection, from Jouffroy, Lamennais, Pascal! Cf. *les Contemporains*, I, 203: "Cet homme . . . a passé par la plus terrible crise morale qu'une âme puisse traverser. Il a dû, à vingt ans, et dans des conditions qui rendaient le choix particulièrement douloureux et dramatique, opter entre la foi et la science, rompre les liens les plus forts et les plus doux. . . Et il est gai!"

[11] P. 335. Repeated in *l'Avenir de la Science.*

moines! . . . Ah! que nous étions faits pour nous comprendre! J'ai retrouvé là toutes mes années d'autrefois, mes doutes, mes combats, mes hésitations.[12] J'ai fait ce que je devais faire étant Français; et je crois qu'ils font ce qu'ils doivent faire étant Italiens. . . . ils me lisent et m'apprennent à admirer les *Inni* de Manzoni, admirables expressions de ce *christianisme moral,* auquel se rattachent toutes les intelligences élevées de l'Italie contemporaine, et auquel pour ma part je me rallierais si volontiers à condition qu'on me laissât carte blanche pour la critique dogmatique et historique (p. 417).

Perhaps, as Barrès says, Renan never was a Catholic. But, without trespassing upon doctrine, one may affirm that Renan possessed and retained—and with a genuine *accent mystique*—his spiritual fervor.

It required character to do so in the midst of the personal and public crises which Renan traversed in the difficult years from 1846 to 1850. He is found here holding steadily to *la religion nouvelle* (p. 196). He accepts gallantly the conditions of his own temperament, he practices the intellectual hospitality which was with him inborn, he scrutinizes all testimony, without cynicism but with a fearlessly critical eye. Not a wielder of the big stick,[13] he nevertheless uses the weapons that are germane to him,[14] and in a cause to which he can heartily ally himself we find him sufficiently militant. Notice the zest with which he thrusts at the Minister of Public Instruction, de Falloux (p. 303). When it becomes a question of upholding the gospel of discrimination—for him a spiritual issue—Renan is admirably courageous.

For any student of Renan this new volume of correspondence becomes indispensable, whether the interest be in such issues as have been mentioned or in the intimate details of Renan's daily living or in his relations with Henriette or in the influence of his journey to Italy or in the development of his political philosophy out of the 1848 experiences. For the reader who peruses these letters without bias certain of the charges which have been brought

[12] Here are the marks of a genuinely spiritual crisis.

[13] P. 222. "Celui qui est habile dans l'escrime ne va pas rechercher une lutte à coups de bâtons."

[14] P. 142. "Chacun ne cherche à lutter que par le côté où il se sent fort."

against Renan will fade away, and the great critic will emerge a figure more than ever impressive.[15]

HORATIO E. SMITH.

Amherst College.

THE EARLY VERSION OF THE *COMÉDIE DES ACADÉMISTES.*

Notwithstanding the fact that A. Fabre in 1890 and E. Dannheisser in 1892 pointed out that Chapelain's correspondence furnishes proof that the *Comédie des Académistes* was circulated in manuscript as early as April, 1638,[1] recent works on Saint-Evremond [2] still repeat Des Maiseaux's statement "qu'elle fut faite au

[15] The text of the letters, according to the *Avertissement*, is scrupulously exact, and cut—very rarely—only for family reasons. Fragments of eight of the letters had already been published—singularly enough—in English in the *North American Review* (April 19, 1907), altho the *Avertissement* makes no mention of this. This offers a certain opportunity for verification, and there prove to be several discrepancies. A marginal note published in *NAR* as part of a letter dated March, 1847, occurs in the French text in a letter of August 4, 1847. The second letter of the *NAR* series is absent from the French text, altho it contains details no more intimate than many published. Letter IV in *NAR*, dated March, 1846, is likewise missing from the French text, yet it is important and not unduly personal (cf. p. 24 of the French text where there is evidently a reference to what had previously been said in the letter in question). Such variants are, from the point of view of "la plus scrupuleuse exactitude," disconcerting. Annotations in this edition are few; one of them is a careless and insufficient reference to *l'Avenir de la Science* (Renan's *Table* referred to on p. 346 is, as the editor must know, inaccurate; it does not always correspond with the text, and the passage reproduced in this letter by Renan occurs, with omissions and variations, not in Chapter IV but in Chapter XVII, pp. 358-362).

Nevertheless the collection is invaluable and should be gratefully received. It is now planned (Cf. *Revue Critique*, 1924, p. 39) to publish whatever letters may prove available of those sent by Renan to his friends among writers and scholars. In the interest of a definitive evaluation of the great critic it is to be hoped that the appeal for such material (from Mme Noémi Renan, 16, rue Chaptal, Paris) may be fruitful.

[1] A. Fabre, *Chapelain et nos deux premières Académies*, pp. 168-172. E. Dannheisser, *Zur Geschichte der Einheiten in Fr.*, *ZFSL*, 1892, p. 69.

[2] Cf. Remy de Gourmont's *Notice* to the volume of selections from Saint-

commencement de l'année 1643."[3] Des Maiseaux invoked for this date Saint Evremond's own testimony, but it must be observed that at the end of his life, when it was given, Saint-Evremond had long since forgotten the exact date at which the satire was composed. He made to other contemporaries divergent statements about the play, in conflict especially with the date 1643 which he mentioned to his biographer Des Maiseaux.

In a letter to La Monnoye of August 1698, Bayle states: "J'ai fait consulter M. de Saint-Evremond touchant la *Comédie des Académistes,* dont j'ai un exemplaire depuis longtemps; il a répondu qu'il fit cette pièce étant au collège."[4] Now as Saint-Evremond was born in 1614, and left college in 1630 to join the army, he would have written his satire on the French Academy several years before its foundation! Three months later, Dec. 16, 1698, Bayle gives further information: "Il faut, Monsieur, que je vous fasse part d'une réponse plus précise que M. de Saint-Evremond a faite à la question que je lui avois fait proposer (whether or not he was the author of the *Comédie des Académistes*): deux personnes m'ont fait savoir ce qu'il a répondu. La première se contente de m'écrire qu'il se reconnoissoit l'auteur de la *Comédie;* la seconde a usé de distinction Voici ses termes: Monsieur de Saint-Evremond a répondu qu'il est vrai qu'au sortir du collège il avoit travaillé à la pièce intitulée *Les Académistes;* qu'il n'y avoit pas travaillé seul; que le comte d'Etlan, dont parle le *Chevroeana,* y avoit eu plus de part que lui;[5] que d'autres encore y avoient contribué; que la comédie étoit fort mauvaise, mais qu'il y a 18 ou 20 ans, on la lui renvoya; qu'il *la retoucha et la refit.*"[6] Saint-Evremond, then, assigns to the second reworked version of

Evremond in the *Collection des plus belles pages,* 1909, p. 202. Ernst Mollenhauer in *Saint-Evremond als Kritiker,* 1914, p. 55, gives the date as 1642 without indicating his authority.

[3] *Les véritables Oeuvres de M. de Saint-Evremond,* 1705, I, 3. E. Dannheisser, *op. cit.,* p. 69, states that Chapelain's letters prove that the *Comédie des Académistes* was played in 1638. But they only prove that it was circulated in manuscript. Chapelain says: "Le peuple . . . s'entretient d'une mauvaise comédie *manuscrite.* . . ."

[4] *Oeuvres de Bayle,* IV, 770.

[5] Chevreau states in the *Chevroeana* that the Count d'Etlan was the real author of the *Comédie des Académistes.*

[6] *Oeuvres de Bayle,* IV, 779.

the *Comédie des Académistes*—the one found in his works—the date of 1678, or 1680. To Des Maiseaux he mentioned the latter solely: "Il m'apprit qu'en 1680 Mme la Duchesse de Mazarin souhaita de voir cette pièce, telle qu'il l'avoit écrite; et que son manuscrit s'étant perdu en France, il se trouva obligé de retoucher l'imprimé, ou plutôt de le refondre; mais qu'il ne savoit pas ce que cela étoit devenu. J'eus le bonheur de déterrer cet ouvrage chez la veuve d'un copiste de Mme de Mazarin." [7]

With the help of these utterances, the history of the play can be outlined as follows: In 1638, Saint-Evremond, the Count d'Etlan,[8] and others composed the *Comédie des Académistes*, which circulated in manuscript and aroused Chapelain's and Boisrobert's ire.[9] It appeared in 1650, with a preface signed Des Cavenetz.[10] Saint-Evremond was banished to England in 1661 and, about nineteen years later—"son manuscrit s'étant perdu en France"—he rewrote and transformed the play. For this revision he made use of the printed text of 1650, though he repudiated it as full of mistakes. It is obvious enough that Saint-Evremond, who had not seen the early version of his manuscript for at least nineteen years, could not be trusted, in 1680, to remember exactly which verses occurred in the primitive form of the play. Moreover, forty-two years had elapsed since its composition and the fact that he did not even recall exactly at what period of his life he committed this youthful indiscretion, shows that it had occupied but little space in his memory. He did not attach much importance even to his revised version and, with characteristic negligence, lost again the manuscript of his second text! From all this it results

[7] Cited by Giraud, *Notice sur Saint-Evremond*, in *Oeuvres Mêlées*, p. liii. Des Maiseaux repeats this statement in almost identical terms in his *Vie de M. de Saint-Evremond*, p. viii of the revised edition of 1709.

[8] The count d'Etlan or d'Estelan de Saint Luc, abbé de Chartrice, was the son of the Maréchal de Saint Luc. To him has been attributed a satirical poem, *Le Gouvernement présent ou Eloge de son Eminence ou la Milliade* (also ascribed to Ch. Beys and to Favereau). Tallemant des Réaux states that he wrote satires. *Hist.*, IV, 247. See T. Lebreton, *Biographie Normande; Biographie Univ.;* Moréri, *Dict.*, etc.

[9] *Corr. de Chapelain;* Tall. des Réaux, *Hist.*, II, 414.

[10] Quérard, *Sup. Litt. dévoilées*, I, 909, is the only bibliographer who refers to an edition of 1646, of which, however, no copy has been found, and which was unknown to Saint Evremond himself.

that Saint-Evremond's statements about the *Comédie des Académistes* must be, if possible, carefully tested by other evidence.

In print two different texts of the *Comédie des Académistes* are available, and neither of the two can be said to represent the original version:

A)—The text of the edition of 1650, in five acts. This text has been reprinted by Livet in his edition of Pelisson and d'Olivet's *Histoire de l'Académie Française,* vol. 1. According to Des Maiseaux, "quand elle fut imprimée en 1650, M. de Saint Evremond ne la reconnoissoit plus" and "M. de Saint-Evremond désavouoit cet imprimé." [11]

B)—The rewritten text of 1680, in three acts, again revised about 1705, when Des Maiseaux prepared his edition of the works of de Saint-Evremond.[12]

No attention seems to have been paid to the manuscripts of the play still in existence. Since they were passed on from hand to hand, "sous le manteau," for twelve years at least, it is not astonishing to find that they are rather numerous. Among them the *Ms. F. F. 20038* of the Bibliothèque Nationale deserves special attention since it bears the date of 1638, the very year that, according to Chapelain's letters, the satire was first known to the public. Since this MS. dates from the year of origin of the play, it must constitute its earliest version, or, at all events, a text far nearer to the original draft than either the disavowed edition of 1650 or the modified text of 1680.

Its title, different from that of the printed versions, reads: *Comédie où l'Académie françoise est représentée faisant ses fonctions sur la réformation de la langue. De l'invention de Q. C. D. R. 1638.* Its sarcastic *Dédicace* is signed *Un Tel,* instead of *Des Cavenetz,* as in the edition of 1650. I print it here, because of its historical interest and its bearing upon the prestige of the French Academy in the early years of its existence.[13]

[11] *Vie de M. de Saint-Evr.*, p. vii.

[12] He states: "Il la revit avec moi et c'est sur la copie que j'en fis que nous l'avons imprimée à la tête de ses ouvrages," *op. cit.*, p. vii.

[13] Livet, *op. cit.*, has not reprinted the *Dédicace* of the extremely rare edition of 1650.

Aux Autheurs de l'Académie qui se meslent de réformer la langue, excepté Gomberville.

Messieurs,

Il est très juste de vous dédier cet ouvrage puisque vous en avez fourni le sujet et qu'il n'y a point de gens au monde qui méritent ce petit honneur si bien que vous. Ne vous laissez pas gaigner aux excessives louanges que je vous donne, car, étant généreux comme je suis, il me fasche de corrompre l'intégrité de mes juges et d'obtenir par complaisance une approbation que je n'aurais pas méritée. J'ay cru d'abord, vous voyant tellement engagés, que vous seriez prévenus de passion et sur cette fantaisie, qui m'a trompé quelque temps, j'ay consulté des autheurs dont le jugement doit estre d'autant plus sain qu'il est plus désinteressé que le vostre. Quand j'ay considéré leurs ouvrages, j'y ay trouvé de beaux sentimens et, à dire vray, j'eusse consenti qu'on leur eust donné la réputation qu'ils ont cherchée; mais sitost que j'ay comparé ces Messieurs avec vous, j'ay cogneu la foiblesse de leurs sens par la force de vostre raisonnement et me suis estonné mille fois qu'on trouvast des bestes et des anges parmy les hommes. Quelques intéressés que vous puissiez être, j'advoue que vous estes seuls capables de bien juger; comme vous avez l'esprit excellent, vous avez l'âme parfaitement belle et qui considérera que vous passez les années toutes entières à la réformation d'un mot, se persuadera très aisément que vous employez toute vostre vie à combattre les mauvaises inclinations qui nous perdent. Je ne m'estonne point si vostre esprit ne trouve rien qui lui empesche la liberté de ses fonctions. Vous estes si sobres qu'il ne s'eslève aucune vapeur au cerveau et si chastes que vous conservez tous vos esprits pour la continuelle méditation où vous vivez. Aussi n'est-ce pas merveille que vous soyez excellents prophètes puisqu'outre la bonté du tempérament, vous avez encore les deux qualités que Balzac a tant désirées pour la prophétie. Mais servez vous des divinations aux affaires que vous savez si heureusement prédire. De moy, je ne veux que la censure ou l'approbation du petit ouvrage que je vous offre. Je n'ay point voulu consulter les morts ny tirer des règles qu'ils nous ont laissées les satisfactions que j'attens. Je ne trouve point aussi d'autheurs à présent, excepté vous, que je veuille croire, car de suivre le génie de Théophile, imiter les descriptions de St. Amand, chercher l'art de Malherbe ou l'esgalité de Racan, c'est une chose à mon advis très indigne d'un honnête homme, puisque vous effacez par les louanges que vous méritez toute la gloire que ces Messieurs là vous ont acquise. Mais pour ne plus parler couvertement, je suis de vos sottises et de vos laschetés,

le grand ennemy,

Un Tel.

Besides the *Dédicace,* the principal difference between the MS. of 1638 and the edition of 1650 consists in the addition of two strophes to the song which Saint Amant is supposed to sing:

C'est en ce temps que les douleurs
Triomphent de nostre foiblesse;
C'est en ce temps que tout nous blesse
Et nous n'avons rien que des pleurs.
Mais sitost que les ans nous permettent l'usage
De ce nectar si doux,
On peut emplir la couppe et voir fuir à la nage
Les plaisirs et courroux.

On boit bien chez le grand Pluton,
On s'enyvre chez Hypocrate,
On meurt buvant comme Socrate,
On boit de nuit comme Caton.
On pourra, triompher ainsi comme Alexandre
Avec l'ayde des pots!
Si nous aimons le vin nous en peut-on reprendre
Que fort mal à propos?

There are, furthermore, about forty minor variants, ranging from a single word to almost a full line between the MS. of 1638 and the printed text of 1650, so that, on the whole, both versions are remarkably similar.

The conclusion is unavoidable that Saint-Evremond, when he discarded the 1650 edition, was not solely spurred on by the mistakes it contains, but rather by his desire to improve the play. That such was his object can be clearly seen from the fact that he reduced it from five acts to three, suppressed the ironical *Dédicace* and bolstered up some of the weaker passages by a number of new lines.

GUSTAVE L. VAN ROOSBROECK.

New York University.

HIATUSERSCHEINUNGEN IM ALTISLÄNDISCHEN

I

Bei den Zahlwörtern níu *'neun' und* tíu *'zehn'*

Der Hiatus $\hat{\imath} + u$ bei den Zahlwörtern *níu* und *tíu* bleibt noch immer unerklärt. In den aisl. Grammatiken werden *níu* und *tíu* nur als unregelmässige Formen erwähnt, ohne dass irgend ein Versuch gemacht wird, dieselben zu erklären (vgl. z. B. Noreen[3], § 127[b], b, 2, Heusler[2], § 97, 4b).

Ich masse es mir nicht an, eine endgültige und beweiskräftige

Erklärung dieser unregelmässigen Formen vorbringen zu können. Bei der schwierigen Natur des Problems darf ich nur hoffen, dass der folgende Erklärungsversuch eine ernste Berücksichtigung verdient.

Wir sehen, dass bei den Formen *níu*(<**niu*(*n*) = got. *niun*) und *tíu*(<**tihu*(*n*)<got. *taíhun*) die Vokale *í* + *u* sich der regelrechten Verschmelzung zu *jú* entzogen haben. Es liesse sich der Grund zu diesem Unterbleiben der Vokalschmelzung vielleicht dadurch erklären, dass das *-u* hier als die Pluralendung *-u* des Nom.-Akk. neutr. der nominalen *a*-Flexion empfunden und somit die unflektierbaren Formen *níu* und *tíu* als erstarrte Pluralformen angesehen wurden.

Dagegen ist das Zahlwort *þrjú* 'drei' Nom.-Akk. neutr. der regelrechten Entwicklung aus **þrí-u*(<got. *þrija*) unterworfen. Man soll aber beachten, dass *þrjú* Adjektiv ist und eine vollkommene Flexion besitzt, während *níu* und *tíu* von Hause aus unflektierbare Substantiva sind. Da nun im Gegensatz zu *þrjú* die Formen *níu* und *tíu* unflektierbar waren, so war der Vokal *u* als Kennzeichen des Plur. um so nötiger, als *níu* und *tíu* keine anderen Formen besassen; bei einer Verschmelzung des *î* + *u* zu *jú*(d. h. **njú* und **tjú*, gleich *þrjú*) hätte der Vokal *u*, da er hier als Stammvokal dient, nicht die Pluralform deutlich zu erkennen gegeben.

Merkwürdig ist es weiter, dass im Aisl. nicht nur die unflektierbaren Zahlwörter *níu* und *tíu*, sondern auch das unflektierbare Zahlwort *sjau* '*sieben*' dessen urnord. Form(**síu*) gleichfalls auf *-u* auslautete, unregelmässig entwickelt sind. Lautgerecht hätte uns urgerm. **siƀun*(= got. *sibun*) eine Form **sjú*(vgl. neuschw. *sju*) ergeben, gerade wie **njú*: **tjú* aus urgerm. **niun*: **tehun*; d. h. **siƀun*>**siu̯u̯-u*(vgl. Noreen[3], § 217, 3)>**síu*(vgl. Noreen[3], § 227, 2)>aisl. **sjú*; vgl. **hîu̯u̯-un*(= ahd. *hîwun*)>**hí-u*>*hjú* 'Ehegatten.'

Keine bis jetzt vorgebrachte Erklärung der aisl. Form *sjau* ist überzeugend. Ich kann mich nicht mit Falk und Torp(*Norw.-Dän. Etym. Wörterb.*, II, 1229 sub *syv*) einverstanden erklären, die in aisl. *sjau* "Brechung von *e* zu *ja*" sehen, weil meiner Ansicht nach die urnord. Grundform des Wortes nicht *sEƀu(*n*), sondern *sIƀu(*n*) gewesen sein muss; das *u* der Endsilbe erfordert

im Urnord. ein *i* der Wurzelsilbe, gleichgültig aus welchem indogerm. Vokal (vgl. lat. *septem*, gr. ἑπτά) dieses *i* entwickelt sein mag.

Ich glaube nicht, dass sich die aisl. Form *sjau* als lautgerecht aus **sibun* erklären lässt. Ich vermute vielmehr, dass die Form *sjau* eine Umgestaltung des lautgesetzlichen **sjú* darstellt und zwar nach dem Vorbild von dem flektierten Adj. *tvau* 'zwei' Nom.-Akk. neutr.

Die Form *tvau* ist aus **tva*[1] (= got. *twa*) + *u* wohl nach dem Muster von dem Demonstrativpronomen *þau* (<**þô* + *u*, vgl. *þou* der Runeninschrift *Noleby*) entstanden. Das *u* in *tvau* ist also eigentlich die angefügte Pluralendung des Nom.-Akk. der nominalen *a*-Flexion.

Gegen die Vermutung, dass die aisl. Form *sjau* eine Umbilddungsform des lautgesetzlichen **sjú* nach dem Muster von *tvau* darstellt, ist hervorzuheben, dass die Form **sjú* auf einer Stufe mit den Formen **njú* und **tjú* steht, und demnach hätte man ebenso gut statt *sjau* eine Form **síu*, gleich *níu* und *tíu*, erwarten können. Weshalb dies nicht der Fall gewesen ist, bin ich nicht imstande zu ermitteln.

Jedenfalls aber dürfen wir die aisl. Formen *sjau*, *níu* und *tíu* nicht als lautgerecht ansehen. Da bei diesen unregelmässigen Formen ein Stammvokal + *u* (bei *sjau*[2] zum fallenden Diphthong geworden) sich vorfindet, so liegt die Vermutung nahe, dass diese Formen unter dem Einflusse von der nominalen *a*-Flexion entstanden sind, wo ein *-u* als Pluralendung dem Stamme hinzugefügt wurde (vgl. *tva-u*, *þa-u*, ebenso *sja-u*, *ní-u*, *tí-u*), was den Hiatus *î* + *u* bei *níu* und *tíu* erklären könnte. Hier ist ja auch weiter der Einfluss von *ellif-u* 'elf' und *tuttug-u* 'zwanzig,' welche beide auf den Vokal *-u* auslauteten, mit in Betracht zu nehmen. Später ist das *-u* der Endsilbe in *ní-u*, *tí-u*, *ellif-u* und *tuttug-u* zu *-o* geschwächt (vgl. *ní-o*, *tí-o*, *ellef-o*, *tottog-o*).

Schliesslich sei bemerkt, dass die Form *níu* ihren langen Vokal *î* wohl dem Einfluss von *tíu* verdankt[3], denn lautgerecht hätte urgerm. **niun* im Aisl. eine Form **niu* mit kurzem *i* ergeben.

[1] Die lautgesetzliche Form *tvá* mit gedehntem Vokal liegt auch vor (vgl. Noreen[3], 435).

[2] Dagegen sind die Formen *níu* and *tíu* zweisilbig, d. h. *ní-u*: *tí-u*.

[3] Vgl. im Ahd. neben lautgerechtem *niun* 'neun' auch die Form *niw*-an (*Otfrid* II, 4, 3), deren Endung *-an* unter dem Einflusse von *zeh*-an 'zehn' entstanden ist.

II

Beim Optativ präs. des Verbum substantivum

Über die Lautgestalt des Opt. präs. des Verbum substantivum im Aisl. macht A. Heusler (*Aisl. Elementarb*[2]., § 336) die folgende Bemerkung: " Der *Optativ* fordert in den älteren Gedichten *zweisilbige* Formen. Setzt man sie mit Recht als *séa, séir, séi* usw. an (nicht als *sía, síir, síi*), so können sie den got. Formen nur auf einem Umweg gleichgestellt werden: urn. **sīēʀ*, **sīē* (got. *sijais, sijai*) wurde früh zu **sēʀ*, **sē*; hier stellte man die gewohnten Optativendungen her: **sē-iʀ*, **sē-i* wie **bū-iʀ*, **bū-i* zu *búa* " wohnen "; danach dann auch die 1. Sing. **sē-a* (statt **sīa*). Im 12. Jahrhundert wurden diese zweisilbigen Formen kontrahiert."

Aus Heuslers Deutungsversuch ersieht man aber nicht, auf welchem Wege ein urn. **sīēʀ*, **sīē* zu **sēʀ*, **sē* hätte werden können. Aus dem Ausdrucke " urn. **sīēʀ*, **sīē* wurde früh zu **sēʀ*, **se* " dürfte man folgern, dass er hiermit einen lautlichen Übergang von *ī* + *ē* in *ē* bezeichnen wolle. Eine solche Annahme wird aber durch die Tatsache widerlegt, dass bei der Verschmelzung zweier *gleichartiger* an einander stossender Vokale immer der *betonte* Vokal sich *zu Kosten des unbetonten* geltend macht.[4] Da nun das -*ē* der Endsilbe in urn. **sī-ēʀ*, **sī-ē* sicher schwach betont war, so hätten wir lautgerecht im Aisl. nicht *sér, sé*, sondern **sír*, **sí* (vgl. ahd. *sīs, sī*) erwarten dürfen.

Ich glaube nicht, dass ein urn. **sī-ēʀ*, **sī-ē* usw. auf lautlichem Wege zu aisl. *sér, sé* usw. hätte werden können; wir werden wohl

[4] Vgl. Heusler, *Aisl. Elementarb.*[2], § 97, 4, b. Heusler ist (*a. a. O.*, § 96, 3) meiner Ansicht nach im Unrecht, wenn er die Entwicklungsstufen von urn. **frīandiʀ>frǽndr* als **frīandiʀ>*frīœndʀ>*frjǿndr>frǽndr* bezeichnet. Da der helle Vokal *i* sonst nur vor dunklem Vokal in den Übergangslaut *i̯* (*j*) übergeht, so muss wohl das *ī* in **frīandiʀ* doch in *j* übergegangen sein schon vor der Zeit, da das gleich folgende *a* durch *i*-Umlaut zum hellen *ǣ* geworden war. Die Entwicklungsstufen sollten demnach sein: urn. **frīandiʀ>*frjándiʀ>*frjǿndr>frǽndr*.

Weiter ist **frīhelsa* wohl nicht zu **frjelsa>frelsa* geworden, wie dies Heusler (*a. a. O.*, §§ 96, 3; 141, Anm. 2) will. Da der Vokal *ī̯* vor (später geschwundenem *h*, ausser wenn in der folgenden Silbe ein *ī̆* oder ein *ū̆* zur Zeit des Überganges stand, sonst in *ē* übergegangen ist, so ist wohl **frīhelsa* zunächst nicht zu **frjelsa*, sondern zu **frḗ-elsa* geworden. Demnach sollten die Entwicklungsstufen sein: **frīhelsa>*frē-elsa>*frēlsa>frelsa*. Ebenso Noreen, *Aisl. Gr*[3]., § 125.

auf anderem Wege die Erklärung der Formen aisl. *sér, sé* gegenüber den got. Formen *sijais, sijai*(>urn. **sī-ēR*, **sī-ē*) suchen müssen.

Wie Heusler richtig bemerkt, können die älteren aisl. Formen *séa, séir, séi* den got. Formen nur auf einem Umweg gleichgestellt werden. Da die Annahme eines lautlichen Überganges urn. **sī-ēR*, **sī-ē*>**sēR*, **sē* hinfällig ist, so ist dieser Umweg wohl in einer Umgestaltung der Formen urn. **sī-ēR*, **sī-ē* zu **sēR*, **sē* zu suchen, und zwar nach dem Vorbild des Typus **tī-h-ēR*>**tē-ēR*>**tēR*; **tī-h-ē*>**tē-ē*>**te* (got. *teihw-ais, teihw-ai*), woraus aisl. *tér, té* 'du zeigest,' 'er zeige' usw. Mit dem Typus **tī-h-an* (mit langem *ī* der Stammsilbe) ist weiter der Typus **sĕ-h-an* = got. *saíhwan* (mit kurzem *ĕ* der Stammsilbe) zusammengefallen, vgl. **sĕ-h-ēR*>**sē-ēR*>**sēR*;**sĕ-h-ē*>**sē-ē*>**sē*, 'du sehest,' 'er sehe,' usw.

Verba mit dem jüngeren durch Ausfall des intervokalischen *-h-* entstandenen Hiatus *ē* + *ē* lagen also in urn. Zeit häufig vor. Dagegen ist urn. **sī-ēR*, **sīē* der einzige Fall, wo ein ursprünglicher Hiatus *ī* + *ē* anzusetzen ist (hier natürlich auf Grund des got. *sijais, sijai*). Weiter ist ein jüngerer Hiatus *ī* + *ē* überhaupt nicht entstanden, weil ein Stammvokal *ī* vor ursprünglichem *h* gegen ein *ē* der Endsilbe nach Ausfall des *-h-* überall zu *ē* geworden ist. Es ist also ganz gut möglich, dass die Formen des Opt. präs. des Verbum substantivum, **sī-ēR*, **sī-ē*, die einen sonst nicht vorkommenden Hiatus *ī* + *ē* enthielten, in die Bahn von denjenigen (häufig vorliegenden) Verben abgelenkt worden ist, welche den Hiatus *ē* + *ē* enthielten; d. h. die Formen urn. **sī-ēR*, **sī-ē* sind zu **sē-ēR*, **sē-ē* (woraus **sēR*, **sē*) umgestaltet worden nach dem Vorbild von dem häufig vorliegenden Typus **tē-ēR*, **tē-ē*; **sē-ēR*, **sē-ē* (zu resp. **tīhan*, **sĕhan* Inf.).

Wenn diese Annahme richtig ist, so ist urn. **sī-ēR*, **sī-ē* nicht "schon früh" zu **sēR*, **sē* geworden, wie dies Heusler meint, sondern die Formen urn. **sēR*, **sē* sind erst jüngeren Ursprungs, d. h. Umgestaltungsformen nach der Zeit der Entstehung des jüngeren Hiatus *ē* + *ē* entwickelt. Übrigens liegt überhaupt kein Grund vor, das *ē* in aisl. *séa* (später zu *sjá* geworden) 'ich sei' für älter zu halten, als das *ē* z. B. in aisl. *téa*(>*tjá*) Opt. präs. 'ich zeige,' oder in aisl. *séa*(>*sjá*) Opt. präs. 'ich sehe.'

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT.

University of Kansas.

FURTHER NOTES ON *PAN Y TOROS*

Some years ago I discussed in this journal (xx, 145-148) the bibliography of *Pan y toros,* and an English translation of the Spanish satire. The earliest printed edition, so far as is known, was published at Madrid, by Don Santiago Fernández, 1812. In this edition the work is ascribed to Jovellanos. The satire has also been attributed to Pedro Centeno. That the work was written before 1812 is obvious enough, because it refers to conditions in Spain under Charles IV (1788-1808). An undated edition in the Ticknor Library states on the title-page that *Pan y toros* was an address made by Jovellanos in the bull-ring of Madrid about 1796 ("por los años de 1796"). Other editions date it more vaguely "en el reinado de Carlos IV."

There has been in my possession for some time a manuscript of the satire, entitled *Oración apologética en defensa del Estado floreciente de nuestra España, año de 1804.* It has numerous minor variants, like "ha conseguido evitar" for "ha evitado," "servir a la opresión a sus ciudadanos" for "servir a la opresión de sus conciudadanos," etc. This manuscript was not necessarily written in 1804, but is apparently a transcript of one bearing that date.

More interesting and important is the discovery that a few paragraphs of *Pan y toros* occur in the *Correo literario y económico de Sevilla* (I, 1803). In the issue of October 15 there appeared a *Carta de Mr. de Maupertuis, Del derecho que el hombre tiene sobre las bestias.* The caption reads as follows: "Deseando contribuir enquanto esté de nuestra parte á la diversión del Público, legitimamente congregado en la gran Plaza de Toros de esta Ciudad, en las tardes de los días 17 y 18 del presente, le ofrecemos la siguiente carta, para que se entretenga interín sale el primer Toro." After the letter, which is a plea for humane treatment of animals, there is a "P(ost) D(ata) Torera," as ironical as the caption. In the number corresponding to November 19, a subscriber signing himself "El Apologista de la Tauromanía," "Sevilla 18 de Octubre de 1803," replies to the "sátira mordaz, que baxo mil jocoserías trae la P. D. torera del Correo del 15 del pasado." The reply is written in the same ironical tone as the "P. D. Torera," and proba-

bly was the work of the same editorial writer. After two introductory sentences, the argument against bull-fights is, with a few verbal changes, the same as in *Pan y toros* (pp. 23 ff. of the Madrid, 1812, edition). Have we here brazen plagiarism of a satirical pamphlet that circulated in manuscript until Spain won freedom of the press, or is this the first draft of a portion of *Pan y toros?* Neither Centeno nor Jovellanos appears in the list of subscribers to the *Correo.* The editor of the journal was Justino Matute y Garviria, and the principal collaborators, Félix José Reinoso, Alberto Lista, José María Roldán, Tomás José González Carvajal, Francisco Núñez y Díaz, Manuel María del Mármol, José María Blanco y Crespo, Francisco de Paula López de Castro, and José Marchena.

As the *Correo literario y económico de Sevilla* is not easily accessible, the first paragraph (p. 115) of the letter to the editor is quoted here, followed by the corresponding portion of *Pan y toros* (ed. Madrid, 1812):

(1) No hé podido sufrir con paciencia la sátira mordaz, que baxo mil jocoserías trae la P. D. torera del Correo del 15 del pasado. ¿Pues que no sabe, quien así se atreve á injuriarnos públicamente á todos los aficionados, que en el anfiteatro augusto de las plazas de Toros es donde se conoce el mérito español, y se vé el buen gusto y delicadeza nacional? ¿Ignora que las fiestas de toros son los eslavones de nuestra sociedad, el pábulo de nuestro amor propio, y los talleres de nuestras costumbres políticas? Reflexione qualquiera que sea anti-torero, que estas fiestas son las que nos caracterizan, y nos hacen á los españoles singulares, entre todas las naciones de la tierra: porque abrazan quantos objetos agradables é instructivos se pueden desear, templan nuestra codicia fogosa, é ilustran nuestros delicados entendimientos, dulcifican nuestra inclinacion laboriosa, y nos preparan las acciones generosas y magnificas. Todas las artes, y ciencias concurren á perfeccionarlas, y ellas á porfia á perfeccionar las ciencias y las artes. Hasta á el baxo pueblo le proporcionan la diversion y la holgazanería, que es un bien; y le impiden el trabajo, que es un mal. . . .

(2)—No, Pueblo mio: no es mi fin el ponerte colorado, sino el demostrar que nuestra España es a un mismo tiempo niña, muchacha, jóven, vieja, y decrépita, teniendo las propiedades de cada uno de estos periodos de la vida civil: conozco tu mérito, y en éste augusto anfiteatro, donde solo celebra sus asambleas el pueblo Español, estoy viendo tu buen gusto y tu delicadeza. *Las fiestas de toros,* son los eslabones de nuestra sociedad, el pábulo de nuestro amor pátrio, y los talleres de nuestras costumbres políticas.

Estas fiestas que nos caracterizan, y nos hacen singulares entre todas las naciones de la tierra, abrazan quantos objetos agradables é instructivos se pueden desear: templan nuestra codicia fogosa: ilustran nuestros entendimientos delicados: dulcifican nuestra inclinacion á la humanidad: divierten nuestra aplicacion laboriosa, y nos preparan á las acciones generosas, y magnificas: todas las ciencias, todas las artes concurren á porfia á perfeccionarlas, y ellas á porfia perfeccionan las artes y las ciencias: ellas proporcionan hasta el bajo pueblo la diversion, y holganza, que es un bien; y le impiden el trabajo, y la tarea, que es un mal. . . .

MILTON A. BUCHANAN.

University of Toronto.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF TWO PAMPHLETS AGAINST LA MOTTE'S *INÈS DE CASTRO*

Houdart de la Motte's successful tragedy *Inès de Castro,* represented for the first time at the Théâtre français on April 6, 1723, was greeted soon after its appearance by a considerable number of critical pamphlets and parodies. Gerhard Dost in his *Houdar de la Motte als Tragiker und dramatischer Theoretiker* [1] lists several attacks against it, but does not identify the authors of many of these productions. Among the unidentified brochures are: *Le Sentiment d'un Spectateur français* and *Les Antiparadoxes.*

In a curious brochure of 1724, *Suite du Secrétaire du Parnasse,*[2] the poet and satirist François Gacon mentions the *Antiparadoxes* and *Le Sentiment d'un Spectateur français,* attributing the authorship of the former to the Abbé Desfontaines and of the latter to Thieriot. Gacon states: "—ce n'est pas à tort qu'on l'a (l'abbé Desfontaines) soupçonné d'être l'auteur des *Antiparadoxes* qu'il a, dit-on, composé pour servir de commentaire aux *Paradoxes.* Ces *Antiparadoxes* au gré des fins connoisseurs valent encore mieux que les *Paradoxes* et il n'y a—, de tous les écrits qu'on a faits sur l' *Inès de Castro* que ces deux-ci qui méritent d'être achetés, si l'on

[1] Weida i. Th., 1909, p. 40. It is interesting to note that Dost has entirely overlooked a considerable number of criticisms of *Inès de Castro;* for example, several listed in Beauchamp's *Recherches sur les Théâtres,* Paris, 1735, II, 462 ff.

[2] Paris, 1724, p. 45.

en excepte cependant *Les Sentiments du Spectateur Français* par M. Thieriot, le Pollux de M. de Voltaire." Even though Gacon often lacked discretion and a sense of justice in his thrusts against his contemporaries, he seems to have been usually well informed concerning what was taking place in the République des Lettres.

As to the first of these brochures, *Les Antiparadoxes* do not present any problem, for the hitherto unnoticed statement of Gacon that the pamphlet was by Desfontaines seems to contain the only attribution of their authorship.

As to the second, *Le Sentiment d'un Spectateur français,* we meet a bewildering confusion of attributions, which I here enumerate:

I. The pamphlet has been attributed to Marivaux because of the similarity of this title with his *Spectateur français,* but, as Dost points out,[3] Marivaux disclaimed the authorship and all acquaintance with the brochure.

II. Paul Dupont in *Houdar de la Motte*[4] ascribes this criticism of *Inès* to the Abbé Desfontaines. He gives no evidence to support this ascription, and it is possible that he confused this pamphlet with others against La Motte's tragedy known to have been written by the Abbé.

III. In the *Catalogue Général des Imprimés de la Bibliothèque Nationale*[5] it is listed as by Passart. This may perhaps be due to the fact that the Sieur Passart expressed his approbation of several attacks upon *Inès.*[6]

IV. Again, in the *Catalogue Soleinne*[7] the authorship of this brochure is attributed to Voltaire. Unfortunately this attribution is not substantiated by any evidence. It is altogether possible that the Bibliophile Jacob had come upon some tradition or old manuscript note which caused him to lay the authorship of the pamphlet at the door of Voltaire.

V. Bengesco notes this attribution,[8] but classifies the brochure among the works falsely attributed to Voltaire. He quotes as his

[3] *Houdar de la Motte als Tragiker und dramatischer Theoretiker*, p. 40.

[4] Paris, 1898, p. 166.

[5] XXIX, 281.

[6] Cf. Beauchamps, *op. cit.*, p. 462 ff.

[7] 1845, V, 104.

[8] Bengesco, *Bibliographie des Oeuvres de Voltaire*, 1882-1890, IV, 323.

3

authority for doubting the correctness of the ascription passages from the letter of Voltaire to the authors of the *Nouvelliste du Parnasse* of June 1731: "Un ami ou peut-être un parent de feu M. Campistron me fait des reproches pleins d'amertume et de dureté de ce que j'ai, dit-il, insulté à la mémoire de cet illustre écrivain, dans une brochure de ma façon et que je me suis servi de ces termes indécents, "le pauvre Campistron."—Je ne sais ce que c'est que cette brochure, je n'en ai jamais entendu parler. Je n'ai fait aucune brochure en ma vie; si jamais homme devait être à l'abri d'une pareille accusation, j'ose dire que c'était moi, messieurs." [9] Beuchot, in a note to Voltaire's letter to Madame la Présidente de Bernières [10] also denies Voltaire's authorship of the brochure: "L'une des critiques de cette pièce (*Inès de Castro*) intitulée *Sentiments d'un Spectateur français* a été attribuée à Voltaire, mais sans aucun fondement."

It should be noted that all the attributions mentioned in this list, with the exception of the one to Marivaux, who, as pointed out above, disclaimed the authorship, are modern. It would seem, then, that the only contemporary attribution which has not been disproved is that made by Gacon to Thieriot. Moreover, this attribution, coming from a man well versed in literary affairs of the day, may well be considered more trustworthy than those of later literary historians.

The information contained in Gacon's *Suite du Secrétaire du Parnasse* helps to account for the fact that the brochure in question was attributed to Voltaire. It is well known that Voltaire borrowed Thieriot's name on at least one occasion, to wit: in his letter known as the *Lettre de M. Thieriot à l'Abbé Nadal.*[11] Was it, then, not natural that the conclusion should be made that he borrowed it for *Le Sentiment d'un Spectateur français?* Voltaire was inimical to La Motte at this time, as is evidenced by references in his *Correspondance.*[12] He had been present at the first representation of *Inès de Castro* and its success seems to have annoyed him considerably. Georges Avenel, one of the collaborators of

[9] Voltaire, *Oeuvres*, Moland, XXXIII, 215.

[10] *Ibid.*, XXXIII, 88.

[11] *Ibid.*, XXII, 13.

[12] *Ibid.*, to J. B. Rousseau, Jan. 13, 1722; to Madame de Bernières, June, 1723, etc.

Beuchot, apparently believed that Voltaire had taken an active part in the polemics around the play, for, in a footnote to letter 85 he states that an obscure line "Je viens de recevoir ce que vous savez" refers without doubt to a parody on *Inès*.[13]

In spite of the fact that Vapereau[14] states that Thieriot "n'a rien écrit," it is known that this friend and factotum of Voltaire did write several letters to the Patriarche de Ferney. Moreover, there occurs in Mangold's *Voltariana Inedita*[15] a letter from him to the Crown Prince Friedrich. *Le Sentiment d'un Spectateur français* may very well be from his pen—the only printed pamphlet which we have from him. Even if the contemporary evidence contained in Gacon's statement is not entirely sufficient to prove Thieriot's authorship, this passage is still of interest and importance in that it gives us a clue as to why Voltaire's name came to be linked with *Le Sentiment d'un Spectateur français*.

GEORGE BYRON WATTS.

University of Minnesota.

A NOTE ON THE TOWNELEY *SECUNDA PASTORUM*

The Towneley *Second Shepherds' Play* begins with the entrance of the First Shepherd. After he has soliloquized for some time, the Second Shepherd enters and soliloquizes in his turn. Finally, however, the two shepherds engage in a short dialogue through which we learn that they are expecting a third shepherd, Daw by name. They decide to wait for him where they are. Daw now comes in, but, like the others, begins with a soliloquy. The subject of his complaint is the weather, which, he tells us, is worse than it has been since the days of Noah. After complaining bitterly about the floods, winds, rains and storms, he continues as follows:[1]

[13] *Ibid.*, XXXIII, 90.

[14] Vapereau, *Dict. universel des Litt.*, 1876, p. 1968.

[15] Berlin, 1901, p. 82.

[1] *The Towneley Plays*, ed. George England, *EETS* Extra Series vol. LXXI, p. 120 (stanza 16). Printed also by J. M. Manly, *Spec. of pre-Shakspearean Drama* I 98 f.; S. B. Hemingway, *English Nativity Plays* p. 192; A. S. Cook, *Literary ME Reader* p. 530; J. Q. Adams, *Chief pre-Shakespearean Dramas* p. 147. See also C. G. Child, *The Second Shepherds' Play*

136 We that walk on the nyghtys / oure catell to kepe,
We se sodan syghtys / when othere men slepe.
Yit me thynk my hart lyghtys / I se shrewys pepe;
Ye ar two all wyghtys / I wyll gyff my shepe
A turne. . . .

He now perceives the other two shepherds, and makes haste to greet them in the following terms:

145 A, sir, God you saue! / and master myne!

These words introduce another short passage of dialogue.

My concern in the present paper is with the longer passage quoted above. The interpretation of the passage now current is founded upon Mr. Kittredge's emendation *tall* for the *all* of the text.[2] This reading forces one, of course, to translate *wyghtys* as 'persons,' or something of the sort, and to interpret the word as referring to the other two shepherds. Daw is thus made to address his fellows as early as l. 139, although advocates of this interpretation would doubtless agree that Daw's words were not meant for the shepherds' ears. But if *wyghtys* refers to Daw's fellows, then *shrewys* does too. In other words, Daw catches sight of the other two shepherds at the beginning of l. 138, although he does not greet them until l. 145.[3] Mr. Cook, indeed, makes him see the others at the beginning of l. 136, while Mr. Child has him do the spying at the beginning of l. 137.

Mr. Child, at least, had compunctions about bowing the knee to Kittredge. He tells us,[4] "One would like to regard *two all* as an idiomatic phrase . . . akin to various Middle English phrases having the sense of 'each and every one' . . . but no direct support can be found for this conjecture." Mr. Child might have mentioned in this connexion the familiar *all two* 'both.' The actual reading might then be explained as a scribal inversion—and scribal inversion is surely no wickeder than Mr. Kittredge's scribal omission. Or *two all* might be defended as a possible

p. 34, and *Everyman's Library* vol. 381, p. 56. Mr. Child's translation has recently been reprinted by Brander Matthews and P. R. Lieder in their *Chief British Dramatists* (see p. 15 for our passage).

[2] This emendation was first published, I believe, by Manly (p. 99, note 1). It has been incorporated into the text by Cook, Adams, and Child.

[3] So Adams *loc cit.*

[4] Child, p. 126.

alternative to *all two,* even as *two first* is in fact an alternative to *first two.* But there is still another possibility. Instead of joining *all* to the word immediately preceding it, we might join it to the word immediately following. If we do this, we get *all-wyghtys,* or, in the singular form, *all-wight* = OE. *ælwiht* 'strange creature, uncanny creature' (*Beowulf* l. 1500). The OE. word would develop phonetically to some such form as *alwight* or *allwight,*[5] and a scribe might well make the false analysis into *all* + *wight.* I am therefore inclined to read the passage practically as it stands:

Ye ar two allwyghtys

and to translate: 'Ye are a pair of uncanny creatures.'

But what creatures is Daw addressing? The shrews, of course, which he has just seen peeping from their holes in the ground. In other words, *shrewys* means 'shrew-mice,' not 'rascals' (as Mr. Child would have it). And my translation certainly fits the passage, for it is of the nature of shrew-mice to peep from their holes, whereas one would be put to it to explain why Coll and Gib should be engaged in peeping—they are standing in an open field, remember, with nothing to conceal and no facilities for peeping even if they had been suddenly seized with an insane desire to be furtive. As a matter of fact they were simply waiting for Daw to come up. If they looked in his direction, they looked in a straightforward fashion—at most, they might have peered. The verb *peep* calls for shrew-mice, not for the two shepherds. And Heywood's proverb, *When all shrews haue dind, Chaunge from foule weather to faire is oft enclind,*[6] explains the lightening of heart of which Daw speaks. When Daw saw the shrews peeping out from their holes, he remembered the proverb and his heart grew light at the thought that the weather would get better.

But if shrews brought good weather, they brought less pleasant things as well. There is plenty of evidence that they were looked upon as dangerous, particularly to the flocks and herds. I take from the *NED.* the following quotations which apply:

[5] The prefix means 'strange, foreign, outlandish,' of course, but in *ME* times it would become phonetically identical with the adjective *all.*

[6] See the *NED* s. v. *shrew* 'shrewmouse.'

s. v. *Shrew*

1545 Elyot, *Dict., Mus Araneus* a kynde of myse called a shrew, whyche yf it goo ouer a beastes backe, he shall be lame in the chyne.

1551 Turner *Herbal* 169 The poyson of . . . the feld mouse called a shrew.

1578 Lyte *Dodoens* 622 The poison of the Scorpion and Shrowe and such like venemous beastes.

1600 Surflet *Country Farm* I. xxviii 195 The shrew by her biting of the horse maketh him oftentimes to die.

s. v. *Shrewmouse*

1587 Mascall *Govt. Cattle, Oxen* (1596) 74 The shrouemouse is an ill beast, and doth trouble and hurt mens cattell.

1614 Markham *Cheap Husb., Bull,* etc. xxxix 61 A Shrew Mouse, which is a Mouse with short vneven legges, and a long head, like a Swine, is a venemous thing.

Note also the compounds *shrew-afflicted, shrew-bitten, shrew-struck, shrew-run* 'paralysed (as a result of being run over by a shrew-mouse)' etc. No wonder, then, that Daw told the mice they were uncanny creatures, and hastened to get his sheep out of the way before any damage was done.

The validity of the present interpretation is made certain by Daw's use of the idiom *give a turne.* This is a technical expression used in coursing, an expression which Daw has carried over to the language of everyday life, much as we do with sporting terms and the like. To give the sheep a turn was to make them save themselves from acute and immediate danger by turning sharply in their course and going ahead as fast as possible in a different direction.[7] In this case the danger was indeed at hand. Two shrews were peeping from their holes, and might come out at any moment. Daw therefore took immediate action, to save, not himself, but his sheep.

Let me summarize. At first, Daw is a bit worried. One sees startling things when one is out, at night, in such foul weather. But his heart lightens when he sees a couple of shrews peep, be-

[7] See the *NED* s. v. *turn* sb. II 14.

cause that means fair weather and in fair weather the forces of evil are not abroad. Yet, though Daw is no longer worried about himself, he is worried about his sheep, which may be made lame if the shrews get at them. He therefore drives the beasts away from this dangerous little animal.

KEMP MALONE.

Johns Hopkins University.

REVIEWS

The Chief British Dramatists, excluding Shakespeare. Edited by BRANDER MATTHEWS and PAUL ROBERT LIEDER. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. 1924. Pp. xviii + 1084. $4.00.

Chief Pre-Shakespearean Dramas, a selection of plays . . . by JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. 1924. Pp. vii + 712.

The Houghton Mifflin Co. has done a service both to the student and to the general public in publishing collections of English plays like Mr. Neilson's *Chief Elizabethan Dramatists.* The books under review are welcome additions to the series. They differ markedly in purpose and execution. The *Chief British Dramatists* (hereafter referred to as *CBD*) is a collection of 25 plays meant to "illustrate adequately and even brilliantly the development of the dramatic literature of our language from the Middle Ages to the end of the nineteenth century." In a collection beginning with the Brome play and ending with Henry Arthur Jones, one must of course be content to hit a few of the high spots, and opinions will naturally differ on the choice of the spots. The editors limited themselves, for the most part, to plays "acted on the stage with prolonged success." On the whole, the plays are well chosen (as one would expect them to be), although I regret that *Ralph Roister Doister* was preferred to *Gammer Gurton's Needle* and that Middleton was left unrepresented. When the editors state that "this book has been made for the general reader and student, not for the expert," they both disarm and invite criticism. On the one hand, we can hardly expect a popular book to provide the usual textual apparatus, although when the specific statement is made that a

certain text is being followed,[1] one is a bit disturbed to find that departures from that text are not marked, by notes or otherwise.[2] On the other hand, a book meant for the general reader ought certainly to explain the meaning of unfamiliar words and phrases, make clear the point of allusions and give the source of the quotations that appear in the text. This help would be all the more valuable in view of the fact that even a well informed reader is often put to it to get hold of such information,[3] fundamental though much of it is to him if he is to read with pleasure and understanding. And there is another danger involved in the omission of footnotes. The editors pride themselves on the accuracy of their texts, and so far as I have verified the matter I have found some justification for their pride. Yet when one is not annotating a text one sometimes grows careless about the text itself. Or perhaps it would be fairer to say that the very process of annotation makes for a better text than would otherwise be obtainable. An excellent illustration of this may be found in the third act of the *Way of the World,* where Sir Wilfull tells Witwoud (among other things), "You could intreat to be remembered then to your friends round the rekin." [4] Now once upon a time, for reasons unconnected with the English drama, I read the late Sir John Rhys's interesting paper, *All Around the Wrekin.*[5] By this happy chance, then, I became familiar with the phrase "around the Wrekin" and was led to conclude that the text of our play was faulty at this point and should be emended to "Wrekin." Our editors would doubtless have come to the same conclusion if they had had the task of annotating their "rekin," but since no such duty was laid upon them they let investigation slide and printed as a common noun the name of this hill in Shropshire.

Mr. Adams's volume has a smaller range and, one must add, a greater utility. Mr. Adams explains in his *Preface* the whole point. He says, "I have aimed to tell, as clearly as may be in

[1] As in the case of the *Way of the World* (*CBD* p. vi).

[2] See *CBD* p. 644, col. 2, l. 25.

[3] Thus, not even Mr. Strunk, carefully annotated though his edition is, gives the source of Dryden's quotation from Claudian (*De Cons. Stilich.* III, preface l. 6) in the "Epistle Dedicatory" of his *All for Love* (*CBD* p. 459). Cf. W. P. Mustard, *MLN* XXVIII, 259.

[4] I quote from *CBD* p. 632, col. 2 top.

[5] In *Y Cymmrodor* XXI (1908) pp. 1 ff.

selections, the story of the origin and development of the English drama, to render the plays as intelligible and as vivid to college students as I could, and to make the texts so accurate as to be of genuine service to scholars." The editor has carried out all these aims in the most admirable fashion. He has printed nearly 50 plays, all liberally provided with footnotes for scholar and layman. Of these plays, the first 12 are liturgical plays; the Latin and Mr. Adams's English translation are printed in parallel columns. What with these plays, and the pre-dramatic material which Mr. Adams has printed just before them, the student will gain a very fair conception of the way in which our drama arose. Next come the three liturgical fragments first printed by Skeat, and given by Mr. Adams under the rubric "The Introduction of the Vernacular." Now follows an artificial craft cycle similar to that of Mr. Manly, but more comprehensive. It begins with the Banns of the Hegge Plays (a piece of nomenclature which I decidedly prefer to Mr. Adams's "N. towne Plays"). Other pieces printed by Mr. Adams but not by Mr. Manly are: *Lucifer* (Hegge), *Abel* (Towneley), *Flood* (Chester; Mr. Adams also gives us the Towneley *Flood*), *Pharaoh* (Towneley), *Birth of Jesus* (York), *Chelidonius and Lazarus* (Chester), *Betrayal* and *Trial* (Hegge), *Harrowing of Hell* (Chester), *Resurrection* (Towneley); on the other hand, Mr. Adams does not include the following plays, printed by Mr. Manly: First Norwich *Creation and Fall,* Hegge *Flood,* Towneley *Isaac* and *Jacob,* York *Resurrection,* Chester *Antichrist.* Under "Non-Cycle Plays" Mr. Adams gives us *Duk Moraud, The Play of the Sacrament* and two Digby plays (*St. Paul* and *Mary Magdalene*). Under "Moralities" (= Manly, Part IV), we gain *Everyman* but lose *Mundus et Infans, Hyckescorner* and *Nice Wanton,* a change for the worse, I think. The addition of the *Castle of Perseverance* however makes us even, abridged though it be. Under "Folk Plays" we get the same pieces as those printed in Manly, Part III, except that in place of *Robin Hood and the Potter* Mr. Adams has given us the *Sword Dance* first printed by Sir Walter Scott in his *Pirate.* Under "Farces" we find, besides the good old *Foure PP,* two more plays of Heywood's (*Johan-Johan, Tyb and Syr Johan; Wether*). There are four more rubrics: School Plays (*Roister Doister* and *Gammer Gurton's Needle*); Inns of Court Plays (*Gorboduc* and

Supposes); Court Drama (*Damon and Pithias* and *Campaspe*); and Plays of the Professional Troupes (*Cambises, Famous Victories* and *George a Greene*).

It will be seen that Mr. Adams has provided us with an exceedingly useful book. He has not spared himself in its preparation, and I, for one, am most grateful to him for bringing it to completion. So much for general criticism. As regards details, the time at my disposal was so short that I have been able to examine with care Mr. Adams's treatment of one play only, viz., *Gammer Gurton's Needle.* I offer the results of my examination in the form of a list of suggested footnotes for the play, usually supplementary to Mr. Adams's notes, but sometimes in correction of them. Before giving this list, however, I will mention a couple of details not found in *Gammer Gurton's Needle.* On p. 26, l. 16, it is perhaps not too obvious to be pointed out that *Vetus hospes seculi* means Balaam. I would therefore suggest a footnote to that effect, with a reference to p. 47 bottom. On p. 147, col. 1 bottom, the author's interpretation of the stanza is, I think, erroneous. He was doubtless led into it when he adopted Mr. Kittredge's unfortunate emendation *tall* for *all.* I am printing elsewhere a note on the point, in which I explain in detail what I consider the proper interpretation of the passage.

In the following notes, the reference is always to act, scene and line of *Gammer Gurton's Needle:*

I ii 2, *squrt* 'diarrnoea'; I ii 4, *vylthy glaye* 'filthy clay.' A note on the conventional rustic voicing of initial consonants would be in place here, by way of supplement to the note just above on *cham* 'I am'; I iii 7, *prycked . . . in iagges* 'dressed in rags'; I iii 30, *on her pes* 'to her patching'; I iv 11, *roking* 'crouching' (cf. *coure* I ii 20). See *NED.* s. v. *ruck.* II song 29, *trowle* 'pass'; II i 106, *beraye* 'befoul'; II ii 16, *toyes* 'tricks'; II ii 21, *Here is a good fellow maketh no great daunger.* The line means, 'Here is a good comrade; don't put on such airs.' There should accordingly be a semicolon after *fellow.* II iii 6, *hied* 'sped.' *A man is well hied* means 'A man makes good progress' (spoken sarcastically, of course). Mr. Manly's emendation is unnecessary. II iii 12, *to seek* 'gone'; II iii 20, *paltered* 'mumbled'; II iv 16, *see* 'saw' (cf. IV ii 36 and 40; V ii 224); II iv 38, *callet* 'whore' (the annotation belongs here rather than later); II v 2, *chere* 'manners'; III ii 5, *or* 'before'; III ii 10, *bonable.* To emend to *bomnable* is to spoil the joke; III iii 25, *kut* 'wretch'; *jakes* 'filth'; III iii 26, *skald,* 'scab'; III iii 34,

stued 'from the stews'; III iii 39, *hoddy-peke* 'fool'; III iii 46, *hoyse* 'hoist'; *souse* 'hit'; III iii 48, *tarlether* 'fomenter of evil'; *longs to it* 'goes with it'; III iii 49, *make up thy mouth* 'shut your mouth' (i. e., 'silence you'); III iii 58, *chaunce* 'fate'; III iii 72, *that thou were gone* 'at once'; III iv 3, *dote* 'act queerly'; III iv 18, *rake* 'clean off the anus by scraping with the hand' (a technical term used in farriery); IV i 1, *bandog* 'dog tied up'; IV ii 33, *that I were gone* 'at once'; IV ii 46, *honest* 'honorable'; IV ii 48, *honestie* 'gentry'; IV iii 5, *deuen* 'evening'; IV iv 5, *take her tardy* 'catch her red-handed'; V ii 3, *fained* 'made up, invented'; V ii 29, *and thou groped me* 'whether you seized me'; V ii 62, *dylde* 'reward'; V ii 101, *costard* 'bean' (slang for 'head'); literally, 'apple'; V ii 179, *boxes* 'blows'; V ii 194, *mel* 'meddle'; V ii 204, *amongs* 'meanwhile'; V ii 228, *drift* 'scheme'; V ii 252, *lier lickdish.* Cf. Heywood's proverb: She will lie as fast as a dog will lick a dish; V ii 261, *with you . . . to dispence* 'to let you off.'

KEMP MALONE.

Johns Hopkins University.

Das Wesen der deutschen Romantik. Kritische Studien zu ihrer Geschichte von GEORG STEFANSKY. Hrsg. mit Unterstützung der Gesellschaft zur Förderung deutscher Wissenschaft, Kunst und Literatur in Böhmen. J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung. Stuttgart, 1923. 324 pp.

A doctoral dissertation in the field of German literature based in general upon many years of mature thinking and in particular upon two years of advanced studies in biology, physics, chemistry and medicine, as well as three years of graduate work in history, philosophy and literature, is in itself a rarity. And if in addition such a thesis presents a philosophically, ethnographically, psychologically and esthetically novel and, on the whole, valid interpretation of one of the most perplexing and elusive movements in all literary history, we must ungrudgingly admit that its author has written a unique work. All of this applies to the book under consideration.

In method the work follows quite faithfully the racial and geographical theories of its sponsor, Professor August Sauer of Prague, and their practical application by Professor Josef Nadler

of Freiburg, Switzerland. But it does not content itself with these teachings; it broadens and develops them very perceptibly and utilizes them to great advantage in determining the nature of what is here called the Romantic *Denkform,* in contradistinction to the Classic *Denkform.* The latter, says the author, using a remark of Wilhelm von Humboldt, proceeds *from the idea,* while the former tends *toward the idea.* Further the Romantic form is an intermediate step between an expressly masculine and a purely feminine type and bears, as Nadler has already endeavored to show, an East German stamp, whereas Classicism is characteristically West German. The relation of Romanticism to nature is indirect, manifesting itself usually in symbolism. It would connect the horrible with the beautiful and extend the esthetically beautiful to the broader field of the sublime. The Romantic writers belong, so far as the author's rather equivocal term "irrationalism" is concerned, either to the type of *Magier* (Wackenroder and Brentano) or to that of *Mystiker* (Novalis), or they represent a fusion of the two (Tieck). Finally, Romanticism is an epoch of decadence from the point of view of the history of evolution.

According to the author and his school, literature is, of course, merely one of the ramifications of the large *Kulturzweig* which includes also philosophy and the theory of art. True to this conviction, he considers his subject from every requisite angle, and with marked success. Thus he goes back as far as the Reformation to gather in the many threads making for the religious, political and social development of Germany and the relation of Romanticism thereto. He traces a clear line of evolution from Spener through Lessing and Novalis to Z. Werner. He points to the purely esthetic nature of the religious feeling of Early Romanticism. Everywhere his argument is characterized by sociological premises. The Reformation, for example, is regarded as a necessary consequence of the political conditions in Germany during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; the French Revolution is considered as having been brought about by the fact that the French State under the old régime had become too narrow to permit the cultural life of the nation to assert itself properly; the Classical School was not interested in patriotism because of its absorption in its ideal conception of Greece. Furthermore the book contains exceedingly valuable sections on natural sciences, music and painting, especially the last-mentioned.

As we have already indicated, the author has broadened and developed to a notable degree the *Stammestheorie* of his teachers. He has done so chiefly by toning it down and making it less dogmatic and hence more effective. The best example of this is found in his treatment of Schelling, who, although of Alemannic stock and thus, according to the theory, a Classicist, was so strongly exposed to the Romantic form that the author finds an exception in him and assigns him a position between Classicism and Romanticism. Similarly the author adds weight to the theory by giving it a degree of general flexibility (pp. 119, top; 189, bot.; 191, middle), that is, by admitting in a more or less sweeping manner the existence, side by side with race and geography, of infiltration and influence as literary forces. Such concessions *seem* to weaken the theory; in reality they fortify it. Indeed, aside from its new and highly suggestive revaluation of German Romanticism, the greatest merit of the book, it seems, lies in this more elastic utilization of the theory of *Stamm* and *Landschaft*. For whatever we may think of the general value of the theory (which will yet have to be proved practically and in detail by a long series of minute investigations covering the whole field), we must grant the author that he has rendered it more plausible at least as an approach to Romanticism. A comparison with other recent works on the subject, such as Strich (Deutsche Klassik und Romantik) and Mehlis (Die deutsche Romantik), which use other means of approach, shows to what extent this is true. Stefansky's treatment certainly is more profound and, after one has become accustomed to the intricacies of his style, more helpful and insinuating than that of the others. Possibly his method shows off to the best advantage in the section devoted to contrasted pairs of writers, Goethe-Winckelmann, Lavater-Hamann and Hölderlin-Novalis.

The nature of the book makes it imperative, perhaps, that the author should emphasize more than would seem necessary his method of rationalistic interpretation. It is perhaps also inevitable that he should devote most of his space to the speculative and philosophical writings of the Romanticists, rather than to their works in the field of pure literature. And yet this is to be regretted, for it would seem that many a point now based on the former category could have been made quite as effectively by means of the latter class of works. It appears to the reviewer, therefore, that the title

of the work might well have read: "Das Wesen der romantischen Denkform."

Heine, strange to say, is entirely omitted. Surely the *Stammestheoretiker* are not so enamored of their theory nor so much engrossed in proving it that they would quite ignore this writer, who shows a clear Romantic trend and is at least an important side-light! It would be an interesting undertaking, indispensable to a complete ethnographic investigation of Romanticism, to develop also Heine's particular *Denkform.* To the reviewer he is most assuredly as much part and parcel of the movement as is Kleist, who bulks large in the author's treatment. If the *Stammestheoretiker* are to prevail, they cannot afford to neglect such phenomena as Heine in a book dealing with the nature of German Romanticism.

Considered as a whole and with a view to the effort that it represents, as well as the results that it achieves, the work is extremely important both with respect to Romanticism and general methodology. It is an illuminating and brilliant study, which penetrates to the very borderland where literature, natural sciences, psychology, philosophy, sociology, human geography and the fine arts meet.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL.

Indiana University.

Johannes Pauli's *Schimpf und Ernst,* hrsg. von JOHANNES BOLTE. Teil 2 [Alte Erzähler, Teil 2]. Berlin: Herbert Stubenrauch, 1924. 45, 512 pp.

In the May number of the *Modern Language Notes,* 1924, pp. 314-316, I mentioned briefly the first volume of Dr. Johannes Bolte's new edition of Pauli's *Schimpf und Ernst.* The second volume completing the work has just appeared and will earn for the learned editor and his enlightened publisher, Herbert Stubenrauch, the renewed gratitude of all students of the origin and diffusion of that great branch of popular literature known as jests (*Schwänke*), a class usually treated apart from tales (*Märchen*), although many of the problems of origin and diffusion are common to both classes.

The second volume, pp. 45, 512, deals with the additions of later editors, translators, and notes. As Dr. Bolte remarks a work that

in the course of 402 years has been printed at least 68 times and translated into several foreign languages, may well be said to have a history. And this history does not in the present case end with a dry bibliography of the editions printed since 1522, for the extent, tendency and form of Pauli's work have undergone manifold changes under the influence of the times. Although the first edition, reprinted in the first volume, exceeds all subsequent editions, except Oesterley's, in the number of its stories, the later editions exhibit noteworthy variations, and omissions as well as additions, the consideration of which can give us an insight into the changing taste of the times and the powerful influences exerted by the rise of the *Volksbücher* in the sixteenth and following centuries. To these influences belong in the first place the progress of the Protestant spirit and a more exact knowledge of classical antiquity; and in the second place the development of a new central point for German printing in Frankfort on the Main, to which Strassburg and Basel had to yield their former supremacy.

Pauli designed his work for the entertainment and edification of the inmates of the cloisters and noble families on their estates, as well as for the use of preachers. Undoubtedly it made its way into the circle of well-to-do citizens, for the common man it was too costly from its extent and folio form, although in the later editions the number of the stories was reduced and illustrations were introduced to attract the reader. All this was changed when industrious printers, especially in Frankfort on the Main, issued as *Volksbücher* in a cheap and handy form the romances of chivalry and other entertaining literature of aristocratic society. The confused order of Pauli's groups of stories was replaced by a new and clearer arrangement, the tales which seemed antagonistic to the Protestant spirit were eliminated, sometimes a rhymed moral emphasized the didactic nature of the story,—finally new narrative material was taken from the proverbs and fables of antiquity, from the novels of Boccaccio, the Latin facetiae of Poggio and Bebel, the later German collections of jests by Wickram and his followers and from popular oral tradition. So we find in the Frankfort edition of 1560 a very mixed company of 520 stories, which, however, need not fear comparison with the 698 preachers' tales of Brother Johannes Pauli.

This brief résumé indicates the scope of the second volume of

Bolte's monumental work. Pages 9-40 are devoted to the editions of Pauli printed at Strassburg, Augsburg and Bern before 1556, with detailed notices of the great printers Egenolff, Gülfferich, Feyerabend, etc., with a description of the French, Danish, Dutch and other translations. Then follow, pp. 3-116, the additional stories of the editions from 1533 on, 184 in number, and an appendix containing the nine stories told by Pauli in his sermons and taken down by one of his hearers, a nun.

The bibliography follows with the order of the stories in the later editions and translations. A comparative table is also given of the contents and order of the editions of Grüninger, Egenolff, and Gülfferich. We come, finally, to the part of the work most interesting to the student of comparative storiology, viz., the notes by Bolte to the individual stories. These are preceeded by a list of the works most frequently cited. This list is brought up to date in a final note where such recent works as M. Gaster's *Exempla of the Rabbis,* London, 1924 are mentioned. The notes fill pp. 255-446, and illustrate 887 stories. They are what might have been expected from the greatest living scholar in this field. His notes (with Polivka's) to the Brothers Grimm's *Kinder und Hausmärchen* have made his name known to the world of scholars, and he was prepared for the present work by his editions of Wickram and other similar collections.

The work concludes with useful indexes of words and subjects, the latter of which enables one to consult the comparative notes with ease. In glancing over these notes many interesting questions arise as to the origin and diffusion of the stories, many of which are known all over Europe, and some throughout the world. Great masses of them are found in the manuals for the use of preachers, and Pauli's book may, in a certain sense, be considered the last of this interesting class of literature.

I cannot dismiss Bolte's great work without a renewed expression of wonder that in these troublous times a scholar is able with his other multifarious tasks to produce a work demanding such absorbing research, and that a publisher should be found to produce so splendid a specimen of printing lavished on a work of profound scholarship. It will be a thousand pities if young scholars in this country through national prejudice or neglect fail to make

themselves acquainted with methods of study and scholarly ideals which are so finely illustrated in works like the one just considered.

T. F. CRANE.

Cornell University.

Concerning French Verse, an Essay for English-Speaking Readers of French. By C. C. CLARK. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1922. 209 pp. $3.50.

Here is the first readable treatise on French verse in English ever published. It is free of all technical and scholarly discussions, in simple, clear English, an essay rather than a treatise on versification. All historical treatment has been purposely avoided and with reason; for this book was written for the average intelligent person to help him not only to understand the structure and mechanics of French verse and how it differs from English, but also to appreciate and enjoy French poetry. It is possible to make beautiful French verse to one's own rhythmic sense, but not so possible for one to read it so as to make it agreeable to a listener. We must approach French verse with this point in view: "that it is entirely different from the English and that it is based on certain principles which are inevitable while the French language is what it is." In other words: French verse is French verse and not English verse; and English verse is English verse and not French verse. If all English speaking people who desire to learn to appreciate French verse are willing to start from that principle, the greatest difficulty will have been solved.

The title is appropriate, as Professor Clarke does not go into any detailed explanations. Thus, for example, the chapter on *Division of French Verse* simply states time and name without explaining the differences or even the nature of the various divisions. No clearer explanation of the three systems of verse—quantitative, accentual, syllabic—has ever been given. An essential point, too often overlooked, is stressed and should be kept in mind continually—every system of verse is to be "understood only through a proper appreciation of the peculiarity of the respective language."

The chapter on Stress and Rhythm is remarkable for its clear-

ness. In this the author posits syllable-distance (distance measured in syllables) as the basis of rhythm. He, however, does not explain that these syllable-distances are due solely to the utterance or the logical sense; nor that pauses, rhythms, or beats in French verse depend almost entirely upon the logical sense. The impression the reader derives from this chapter and chapter V, *The Basic Rhythm of French Verse,* is that rhythm consists of a certain number of syllables, rhyme, and arrangement of words so that the last syllable of each line is stressed. This may seem rather mechanical, and the monotony of which he speaks on p. 54-55 illustrated by his *a* scheme would naturally make one feel a monotony where there really is none.

The chapter on *Mute e* seems too long and technical in comparison with the treatment given to other principles. It assumes too much knowledge of pronunciation. The reader should be told that *mute e* is counted in French verse whether pronounced or not (giving exceptions) and made aware of the fact that there are two distinct methods, schools, or tendencies: verse is read as prose by some, as verse by others; in ordinary conversation some pronounce, some do not pronounce *mute e.*

After reading the chapter on Syllable Counting, the reader will undoubtedly be left somewhat bewildered. The author, to avoid dryness and long enumerations, has cut out all definite rules to be found in any short treatise of verse. In this respect the book is unique, and the author deserves praise for his courage.

Many points might be discussed in which the reviewer would differ from the author, but the book deserves the highest commendation for the skill and discrimination shown in presenting such a difficult subject in such an agreeable manner.

HUGO P. THIEME.

University of Michigan.

Contribution à l'étude du vocabulaire d'Alphonse Daudet. By IVAN PAULI. *Lunds Universitets Arsskrift, N. F., Avd.* 1, *Bd.* 16, *Nr.* 6, 1921.

By reading the works of Daudet,—to all appearances with greater exhaustiveness than his predecessor, Miss Mary Burns,[1] the author

[1] *La langue d'Alphonse Daudet* (Paris, 1916).

has found seven hundred words not taken up by the earlier treatise (p. vi). These, with many "remarques," supplementing or criticizing the observations of Miss Burns, constitute the body of the discussion.

Pauli sounds a significant note in his introduction. In answering the question of Brunot: "Qui tentera le Lexique de la langue poétique de notre temps?", he makes it clear that nobody can attempt it without the aid of a series of exhaustive monographs on the vocabulary of the eminent writers of the 19th and 20th centuries, monographs using a definite criterion in the choice of words to be treated and based on accurate texts. The last clause ought to be especially emphasized, for modern, as well as mediaeval texts, require close scrutiny.[2]

In a footnote to the first page of the introduction we are given a list of the efforts to study the language of 19th century writers. A grave omission is the failure to mention Mlle L. Vincent, *La langue et le style de George Sand dans les romans champêtres,* Paris, 1916—reviewed, before Pauli's publication, in *RPF,* XXI (1919) 14, *MLN,* XXXV (1920) 228 [G. Chinard], *MLR,* XV (1920) 327—which, whatever its faults, is wider in scope than Born's work, cited by Pauli.

A commendable feature is the comparison of Daudet's usage with that of other novelists of the century. In this connection, the present reviewer permits himself to add references to the use by George Sand of certain words treated by Pauli: *fade* (8) in *Jeanne,* 73, 83, 230, 231 and *Fadette,* 66, 124; *mitan* (21) in *Jeanne,* 267, *Maîtres Sonneurs,* 57, 129, 134, 191, 369, *Bois- Doré,* II, 180; *pastoure* in *Jeanne,* passim. *Jambé* (99), in the expression *mal jambé,* showing a sense analogous to that of Daudet's use, occurs in *Fadette,* 68. These references would have been known to Pauli had he been acquainted with the work of Vincent, mentioned in the last paragraph. Moreover, we note the analogous use of *vanné* (33) in the expression *vanné de fatigue,* the occurrence of which in *Meunier d'Angibault* 243, *Jeanne* 230 and

[2] Cf. E. P. Dargan, *Balzac's Method of Revision,* read before the Modern Language Association, Dec. 28, 1922. Apropos of Balzac, it may be added that, to the best of the writer's knowledge an adequate treatment of Balzac's rich vocabulary is still wanting.

Claudie, Act I, sc. 1, ought to be mentioned. The argument over *agourmandir* (14) could be more easily settled by mention of the past participle *agourmandé* (cit. Godefroy-Salmon) and its parallel *abouter* (Vincent, *op. cit.,* p. 36). Incidentally, *abouter,* as well as *mignot* and *arbrer* are to be found in *Old French* (Godefr.-Salmon).

The inclusion of a number of words is open to question, or, at least, comment: *casse-cou* (adj. 88), *ficher* (46), *foutre* (46, 47), *gosse* (47), *grue* (37, i. e. as 'woman of loose morals'), *mâtin* interj., 49), *patache* (29), *varsovienne* (90), *victoria* (91) are cited by Larousse (*Grand dictionnaire universel,* [1866-90]); *fichtrement* (46), *marsouin* (48, as 'marine'), *être dans la purée* (50), *rouquin* (51), *tonitruant* (31) are to be found in the *Nouveau Larousse Illustré* (1898-1904), but not in the larger work.[3] It is true that the author states expressly that he includes only words that are not given by the dictionaries of the Academy, Hatzfeld-Darmesteter-Thomas, and Littré. Yet, seeing that Pauli even cites the occurrence of the items in the glossaries of *argot,* he should have at least mentioned them as found in Larousse, despite the popular nature of this work. Moreover, apropos of *varsovienne,* we find that it was imported about 1854; there is evidence that it was a widespread term. If it be granted that the function of a scholar who studies the language of an author is to take up the terms that are in some manner distinctive, the special nature of such words as are cited in the last paragraph might well have been made clearer by additional data.

In general, the *Contribution* of Pauli is worthy of its name. The lexicographer who is to treat the literary language of the nineteenth century (and mayhap also of the twentieth) will find in it a valuable aid.

A. H. SCHUTZ.

University of Missouri.

[3] *Vieille barbe* (32), in the general sense of 'old man' is given by Littré (1872) and still earlier by Bescherelle (1845). Cf. *vieille moustache.* 'old veteran' (Nyrop, *Grammaire Hist.,* IV, § 256, 1), also the following example: "S'il avait de la barbe, je dirais que c'est une vieille barbe de '48" (Ordonneau, Valbrègue, Kéroul, *Les Boulinard,* performed in 1890,—Act III, sc. 1, p. 63 in Harriman's edition, Boston, D. C. Heath & Co.).

Chaucer: The Clerkes Tale of Oxenford, Edited by KENNETH SISAM. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1923, xxvi + 78 pp.)

This is an attractive little book. There are numerous plates, showing, among other things, some of the illuminations from the Munich manuscript of the *De Casibus,* a picture of the well of St. Thomas, and the portrait of Chaucer from the Ellesmere manuscript; and there is a map of the pilgrimage route to Canterbury, and even one of northern Italy (to show where Padua is situated, as well as Piedmont). The Introduction tells something of the tradition of the Griselda story, something of Chaucer's knowledge of Boccaccio and Petrarch; it sketches the problem of dating the *Clerk's Tale,* and the connection of the Tale with the Marriage Group. There are also: a compact account of Chaucer's life, a select bibliography, the "portrait" of the Clerk conveniently quoted from the General Prologue, and, after the text, the prologue of the *Merchant's Tale* wisely added. The apparatus includes a brief study of the language, a note on the metre, and a glossary. This summary of the contents is enough to show that the volume is intended as an introductory primer to Chaucer, and for this purpose its size and material are appropriate.

One is led immediately to inquire, however, why the *Clerk's Tale* should be selected with that end in view. The story of Griselda is representative of one variety of Medieval literature, and yet it also suited the taste of later periods as well. Much more than that, it stands in bad need of its context to be representative of Chaucer. Few of the other *Canterbury Tales* are likely to suffer so much from isolation from their framework. It is hard to imagine, in fact, how the present editor could have appreciated to the full the amazing fashion in which the particular appeal of the story is transmuted by its relationship, in detail, to the monologue of the Wife of Bath and to the other items of the Marriage Cycle. For if Mr. Sisam has observed the alchemy by which pathos becomes tinged with humor and humor with pathos, through the very fact that the Clerk of Oxenford is speaking in such excessive praise of at least one woman, how can he wish to cut away the connections which serve so vitally to bind this story to what has preceded? In a more extravagant way, but no more definitely, we should lose the meaning of the "litel thing in prose," if we took the *Tale of Melibeus* away from its association with Sir Thopas.

This is no place to repeat the evidence for this interpretation of the story. One may note, however, that some of it has not made a favorable impression on Mr. Sisam, when he says that "perhaps the MSS. are right when they call [the Envoy] 'L'envoy de Chaucer,'" although we find therein the definite allusion (1207 ff.) to the *Wife of Bath's Tale.* I observe too that he regards the passage marked "Auctor" (995 ff.) as also Chaucer's own (see his note) in spite of the following line: "Thus seyden sadde folk." One may compare what is more likely to be a real interruption elsewhere in Chaucer's drama (G. 992 ff.) and see how different the manner is. I wonder how many critics will attribute even lines 460 ff. to Chaucer rather than to the Clerk. In the same way it is fair to protest that dramatic reasons led Chaucer to describe himself as looking on the ground after the sadness of the *Prioress's Tale,* and not the matter of personal habit (cf. Sisam, p. xvii and Knott, *Mod. Philol.* VIII, 135 ff.)

Other comments may be briefly suggested. For full information about the Griselda story we may await the publication of Professor Manly's Lowell lecture; the authorities he cites there should be consulted. In the *Index to the Ballad-Entries in the Stationers' Register* (No's. 2486, 482), Professor Rollins proposes that the "Sonnge of pacyente Gressell" is what has been preserved in Phillip's *Commodye.* He has also found some other interesting entries which are *apropos.* As to Boccaccio's composition of the *De Genealogiis Deorum,* it must not be felt that all was loss in this remarkable work, for its wide influence is coming more and more to be recognized. In studying Chaucer's additions to his source further inferences might have been made: particularly, the way in which lines 852-61 emphasize and extend Griselda's brief moment of rebellion, and thus serve to make her more human (as do lines 1086 ff. in expressing her emotion at the reunion). The notes are in general good, especially that on the comparison of "hende Nicholas" with the Clerk. The study of the language is adequate, although one may recall the fact that *e* < A. S. *y* is found in the London dialect and elsewhere in East Midlands in the fourteenth century (cf. Wyld's *Short History of English,* London, 1921, section 158, pp. 101-2). It should no longer be called a "distinctive feature of the Kentish dialect" in Middle English. In the Glossary it is a pity that etymologies or immediate sources were not

given; but here one notes how slight Mr. Sisam's grammatical review is, not including for instance the source of final *e* in Anglo-Saxon feminine nouns (as in *loore,* 87, 788). One quarrels sometimes with his translations of the Middle English: *sentence* (l. 636), according to its context and regular use, denotes "intent" or "opinion"; *shrewe* (1222) preserves its meaning of an "evil person," as again the context shows. One other small matter: Hengwrt has not become "Hengwyrt" (p. xxiv) unless "it be falle of-newe"!

HOWARD R. PATCH.

Smith College.

CORRESPODENCE

A SOURCE FOR BALZAC'S *Le Faiseur*

The enthusiasm of Honoré de Balzac for Rabelais, due not only to the fact that both men were born in Touraine, but also to the many points of likeness in their natures, found its most striking expression in the *Contes drolatiques.* It was, however, shown here and there in his other writings. Rabelais' influence was not limited to inspiration, as may be seen by the close imitation of his language in the *Contes drolatiques.* He sometimes borrowed both the ideas and the turns of expression of his great compatriot. An interesting example occurs in the drama *le Faiseur.*

It will be recalled that though this work mainly presents the distressing tragedy of debt, it is occasionally enlivened by lighter touches. It is in one of these less consequential passages that the example in question occurs. M. Mercadet, the principal character of the drama, is discussing his debts with his wife. In reply to her misgivings on the subject he says, "Quel est l'homme qui ne meurt pas insolvable envers son père? Il lui doit la vie, et ne peut pas la lui rendre. La terre fait constamment faillite au soleil! La vie, madame, est un emprunt perpétuel!" [1]

The ideas he expresses are evidently taken from Panurge's celebrated eulogy of debts, found in the *Tiers Livre,* where the careless spendthrift, rebuked by his friend Pantagruel for his extravagance and asked when he will ever get out of debt, replies, "In the Greek calends," that is, "never." He then breaks out in impassioned praise of debt. For him it is the symbol of the sense of mutual obligation which binds the material universe and human society together. Continuing, he pictures a universe without debts: "Le

[1] *Œuvres complètes de Honoré de Balzac,* Paris, Michel Lévy, 1870, XVIII, 478.

Soleil ne luyra sus leur terre; les astres ne y feront influence bonne; car la Terre desistoit leurs prester nourrissement par vapeurs et exhalations: des quelles, disait Heraclitus, prouvaient les Stoïciens, Ciceron maintenoit, estre les estoiles alimentées." [2]

In chapter four Panurge describes a universe where debts abound. It is the home of joy. All the parts of human society and the human body are united. Man then thinks of offspring: "Ce monde, prestant, debvant, empruntant, est si bon que, ceste alimentation parachevée, il pense desja prester à ceux qui ne sont pas encores nés; et, par prest, se perpetuer s'il peut, et multiplier en images à soi semblables, ce sont enfans"—the rest of the paragraph will hardly bear quotation.[3]

M. Mercadet next says to his wife, "Et n'emprunte pas qui veut!"

Panurge, his model, had said, "Toutesfois, il n'est debteur qui veult; il ne fait crediteurs qui veult." [4]

M. Mercadet then launches into a description of the blissful condition of a debtor: "Ne suis-je pas supérieur à mes créanciers? J'ai leur argent, ils attendent le mien; je ne leur demande rien, et ils m'importunent! Un homme qui ne doit rien, mais personne ne songe à lui, tandis que mes créanciers s'intéressent à moi!"

Panurge says: "Devezvous tousjours à quelqu'un? Par iceluy sera continuellement Dieu prié vous donner bonne, longue cet heureuse vie: craignant sa debte perdre, tousjours bien de vous dira en toutes compagnies, tousjours nouveaulx crediteurs vous acquestera: afin que par eux vous faciez versure et de terre d'autrui remplissez son fossé." [5] And again, "Cuidez vous que je suis aise, quand, tous les matins, autour de moy, je voy ces crediteurs tant humbles, serviables cet copieux en reverences." [6]

One can but admire the good sense with which Balzac thus turned to Rabelais when he needed wit with which to enliven his comedy. The unrelieved seriousness of his preceding dramas had contributed to their failure. On the other hand, Rabelais' boisterous though sometimes heavy pleasanteries, cleverly imitated, had won the suffrage of the literary world for *les Contes drolatiques*. Now he again drew from the same fountain and produced, in *le Faiseur,* both a theatrical and an artistic success.[7]

GILBERT M. FESS.

Hillsdale College.

[2] *Œuvres de Rabelais*, ed. MM. Burgaud des Marets et Rathery, Paris, Didot, 1870, I, 526, 2e édition.

[3] P. 532. [4] P. 525.

[5] P. 523. See the two following pages for a continuation of the subject.

[6] P. 525.

[7] For the initial form of Balzac's ideas expressed above, see his *Pensées, sujets, fragmens,* ed. J. Crépet, Paris, A. Blaizot, libraire-éditeur, 1910, p. 46.

An Address to the Electors of Great Britain . . . Possibly a Fielding Tract

Mr. Frederick S. Dickson, the donor of this two-part pamphlet, records on the page opposite the Yale University Library bookplate several interesting facts and opinions. I quote in full:

"This Address was published in London by Drummond and Company in August 1739. (See the London Mag. p. 416 and the Gentlemans Mag. p. 444.) [The copy presented by Mr. Dickson is dated 1740 Edinburgh.]

According to our Bibliography (pp. 301, 302) we know of nothing from the pen of Henry Fielding after the appearance of The Historical Register on May 12, 1737 until the printing of the first number of the Champion on November 15, 1739, a period of two years and a half, save for some brief letters in Common Sense. Fielding was practically through with the drama and his work on the Champion showed the trend of his mind towards politics.

If this tract ultimately appears to be the work of Henry Fielding it will prove to be an item of the first importance as it serves to fill in some measure a period apparently vacant, and would be the first of Henry Fielding's luminous essays on public affairs. This pamphlet appeared when he was in the midst of his law studies and the references in the first part of this Address to the subjects on which he was then working is to say the least significant.

My own opinion is that Henry Fielding wrote this paper.

March 19, 1923. Frederick S. Dickson."

Now in first looking over this pamphlet the reader finds much to persuade him that Fielding is the author. He sees at once that the old familiar word usage is prevalent, and upon a close examination finds an almost unvaried use of *hath, doth, shew, whilst.* "Yes," says the reader, "this is Fielding." On the title page he reads "Done by an Eminent Hand," and on page 56, "The Author is industriously conceal'd, tho' the Daily Gazetteer, in a mad Fit of Anger, ascribes it to Mr. Fielding." In his cursory examination the reader finds quotations and citations from Lord Coke, Harrington, Cambden, Bracton, Hale, Echard, Matthew Paris, Lock, Rapin, Aristotle, Machiavel, Montagne, and other authorities in Fielding's library or otherwise dear to his legal and historical mind. In two instances he finds the word *Champion*, suggestive of Herculean labors of Fielding; on page 11 a satirical reference to Great Men, "if Titles can make Men great"; and on pp. 70 ff., a reasoned attack on the greatest of all great men, the Prime Minister, Robert Walpole; and on page 88, a very characteristic reference to Jonathan Wyld—all persuasively suggestive of Fielding the political reformer.

If any of the above spellings trouble my reader he may find comfort in the thought that they trouble me. Fielding did once use the spelling *Wyld* (See Cross' *History* I, 380); but I have never before seen *Cambden*, p. 22, 24, *murther* and *murtherer*, pp. 86, 87, 9; *conveened*, p. 23; *Lawier*, pp. 24, 30 (but *yer*, p. 66); *skreen*, p. 51; *Cam* for *Cham*, p. 69. The spellings *Lock*, *Machiavel*, and *Montagne* are customary with Fielding, and in the form *ly* for *lie* (p. 90) Mr. Dickson finds a familiar spelling. On this basis I am inclined at one moment to say this cannot be Fielding, and at the next moment to reverse my decision. And there are other difficulties. Can some student of Fielding tell me when and where he first mentions "the great Sydney"? In this pamphlet he is referred to six times; but I have no remembrance of such a name [1] in Fielding. Was Fielding capable of so bad a sentence as this on p. 93: "Even your Corruptors will then justly despise you, and insult your names behind your Backs; as they now affront your Understanding as well as your Honesty to your Faces, when they offer you a Ball, a Treat, a Purse, or a Bank-Bill, in barter, for what, if you are base enough to sell, they, in a mere venal and worldly Sense of Bargaining, are not rich enough to pay you the Price of." ? Eight times (at least) the word *nay* occurs; does this stir any remembrance in the lovers of Fielding?

Very likely I am too easily persuaded, but I feel sure that this pamphlet is the work of Henry Fielding. It lacks the wit and maturity of the Fielding I know best, but in general style and usage it is markedly characteristic of our author. It is written in the mood of seriousness which might well be the mood of the budding lawyer; it is an opposition tract directed against Fielding's ancient political enemy so celebrated in the *Champion* and in other works of the period. Fielding the magistrate had a very unselfish and noble conception of service to the state; this pamphlet is conceived in the identical spirit of practical idealism.

GERARD E. JENSEN.

Connecticut College.

A NEW ANALOGUE TO THE *Pardoner's Tale*

From 'Flaundres, whylom' to San Francisco of the present day is a Brobdingnagian halloo, indeed; yet in *Just Meat*,[1] Jack London has retold the old tale of Chaucer in the latter place and time. Since London's analogue has not, to my knowledge, been noted,[2] I should like to call attention to it here, representing as it does an interesting pejoration of the ancient Oriental theme.

[1] Sidney, Algernon. His *On Government* (Folio, Lond. 1751) was in Fielding's Library.

[1] Jack London, *When God Laughs*, N. Y., 1911, pp. 93-128.

[2] Miss Hammond, *Chaucer, A Biblographical Manual*, N. Y., 1908; p.

A diamond merchant, having concealed a hoard of diamonds and pearls in his home, preparatory to leaving the country and his unsuspecting partner, is accidentally killed in a skirmish with Matt, a thief. The gems are taken to the room of Matt and his accomplice, Jim; where, on the following morning, the latter poisons the other's coffee and, in turn, eats of a steak strychnined by Matt. Both die after many realistic details of agony.

The main resemblances to Chaucer's narrative are immediately apparent—the underlying motive of avarice, the number of characters concerned,[3] the death of one by violence and of the other two by poison.[4] Important elements of the old theme, however, are either completely lacking or greatly changed.

The warning character,[5] Canby's x factor,[6] is entirely absent. The *accidental* killing of the first character, on the other hand, is a feature not current in any of the analogous stories. In all, there is a deliberate intention, if not actual plot, toward the death of the first. Finally, the poisoning of the survivors by each other, and not by the prearrangement of their victim, is a corruption found only in the *Arabian Nights* version of the tale.[7] Since, in this last rendering, the first character escapes death entirely, we may place London's version before it in the scale of pejoration.

Just Meat was written in 1906, although not published until 1911,[8] after London's visit to the Orient. It is not improbable that on that journey he came in contact with some corrupt form of the legend and turned it to his own narrative use. Part of this last would seem to consist in the emphasis upon details of the death agonies of the poisoned men.

WHITNEY WELLS.

Harvard University.

296, mentions only Kipling's story of *The King's Ankus* as a modern parallel.

[3] One thousand and one in the Buddhist original; five hundred in the Tibetan version; six in *The King's Ankus;* four in the Kashmiri version and Coryat; three in the Persian, all the Arabian, the Italian *Miracle of St. Antonio*, the *Libro di Novelle*, and Chaucer versions: two in the *Cento Novelle Antiche* version; indefinite in the *Morlini Novellae* version. (References: *Originals and Analogues*, Ch. Soc. Pub.; pp. 130-134, 418-430; G. L. Kittredge, "Coryat and the Pardoner's Tale," in *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. XV, pp. 385-7; R. Kipling, *The Jungle Book*, N. Y., 1897, p. 214). Three, however, is the most common number.

[4] As in the Persian, first and second Arabian, *Miracle of St. Antonio*, and *Libro di Novelle* versions, likewise.

[5] Gautama in the Buddhist original, Jesus in the Persian, first Arabian and *Cento Novelle Antiche* versions; St. Anthony in the Italian miracle; the hermit in the *Libro di Novelle* version; the old man in Chaucer; and the White Cobra in Kipling.

[6] H. S. Canby, "Some Comments on the Sources of Chaucer's *Pardoner's Tale*," in *Modern Philology*, Vol. II, p. 477.

[7] The third Arabian verson. In the Coryat version there is no death by violence. Each pair of brothers poisons the other pair.

[8] C. London, *Jack London*, London, 1921, Vol. II, p. 135.

A Reply

I have been reading your reviewer's critique of my volume *Les Techniques de la critique et de l'histoire littéraires* and am left with the unfortunate impression that the casual reader will suppose, from the review and the innuendoes of the review, that I have committed some fault of honor in publishing a work on a subject which has been my life long study, because the publication of Mr. Morize's work preceded mine by some months. My own book, embodying the results of ten years lecturing on the methodology of criticism, was completed on 6. November, 1922. It was on that date that I wrote to the Secretary to the Delegates of the Oxford University Press offering the manuscript, which I delivered on the twelfth of the same month. No substantive amplifications or corrections, other than verbal corrections, were made in it after that date. It was set up actually in page proof starting in January of 1923 before I had even heard of a competitor.

I first heard of Mr. Morize's book from his letter which was forwarded to me in Paris during the following April. In acknowledging the letter I told Mr. Morize that my book had been printing since December, and that I would not read his book until my own was published. His book I found at Oxford on my return, and in fact, owing to the pressure of many duties, I have not yet read it. My only fault, it appears, is that I added the title of his work to my Bibliography, out of generosity for a competitor, without making it clear that I had not read it.

If I must go still further into detail, I would add that I gave 1923 as the date of publication of Mr. Morize's book because I gathered from Mr. Morize's own letter (received in April, 1923) that it had just been published.

Your reviewer comments acidly on my dealing with three works of Diderot, Pascal, and La Boétie in a certain order. I dealt with them because they are the three outstanding works in French which illustrate my point, and I dealt with them in this order because it is the only methodological order. It is inevitable that Mr. Morize, if he takes the same point, should have both chosen them and taken them in this order. The coincidence, if I may say so, is no other than the coincidence of a good knowledge of the subject.

G. Rudler.

Oxford University.

[I did not mean to imply in my review that Professor Rudler had committed a fault of honor in publishing his book and I very much regret it, if anyone has drawn any such conclusion from my comments. What I was trying to show was that Professor Rudler had not in his book given an altogether satisfactory model of literary method. I still think that Professor Morize's book de-

served from him a more extended mention than a bibliographical note of one line, but I fully accept Professor Rudler's explanation of his entire independence with regard to it and am confident that the readers of *M. L. N.* will do likewise.—H. C. L.]

A MS. of Mellin de Saint-Gelais' Works

It may be of interest to call attention to a Vatican manuscript of Mellin de Saint-Gelais' works, unknown to editors of that poet and apparently unsignalled hitherto. Regina latina 1493 is a carefully written paper MS. of the sixteenth century, in-folio, measuring 33.2 cm. by 21.3 cm. and contains 152 folios of which the text occupies 144 and the index eight. The poems are written in single columns of thirty lines to the column. A later hand has occasionally added titles, rubrics and notes.

The collection is very full and includes the *Genèvre* (fol. 124 v-129 v) with the continuation of Baïf (130 r-143 r). Although it gives us no new poems, its readings are of considerable value in furnishing new variants [1] and in confirming others hitherto suggested only by modern editors.[2] It often agrees with the accurate Henry the Second MS.[3] and has one poem (III, 109) and two distichs (II, 30, 31) known only from that MS., as well as three quatrains—added in the later hand—also found only there (II, 15, 16). On the other hand, it does not contain the other nineteen poems which occur in that MS. alone, and in certain readings it agrees with the 1574 edition rather than with the Henry the Second MS. or with the first edition of 1547.[4]

Unfortunately, Blanchemain's edition gives only incomplete and inadequate information regarding variants, so that it is impossible, for example, to establish the relation of the Vatican MS. to the lost Des Portes MS. used by La Monnoye.[5] In fact only a complete collation of all the MSS. and editions would satisfactorily determine the exact position of this new collection. Even superficial comparisons, however, will show that its completeness, reliability, and independence entitle it to high rank, and it must certainly be consulted in any new edition of Saint-Gelais' works.

Grace Frank.

[1] Notably in the poems printed in Blanchemain's edition (Bibliothèque Elzévirienne, 1873): I, 63, 100, 105, 215, 283, 304, 308; II, 196, 202, 259.

[2] For example in the poems printed in Blanchemain's edition: I, 283 (line 7; cf. III, 302); II, 51, 155, 192.

[3] Cf. I, 104, 210, 305; II, 15, 35, 106, 135, 215, 228.

[4] For instance in I, 53, 61, 89, 90, 97, 102, 110, 111, 112, 255, 257, 264; II, 58, 86, 111, 176 (variant c); III, 133.

[5] It agrees with an unidentified MS. known to La Monnoye (probably the Des Portes) in stating that II, 19 was written "pour Madlle de Roman," though these words are in the annotating hand. It contains none of the variants cited by Blanchemain from the La Rochethulon MS.

Old Saxon *Fercal*

This word occurs but once in the Old Saxon *Heliand,* line 5773, and has clearly the meaning of 'bolt':

uuas fercal managantheftid fan helldoron.

Petersson, *Indogerm. Forschungen* XXIII, 398, has connected the word with Latin *pergula* 'shed, outhouse.' This is impossible (cf. Walde, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch,* page 576). No other explanation has, as far as I am aware, been attempted. Yet the word can surely be nothing else than mediaeval Latin *vericulum* or *veruculum* (cf. French *verrou*), which under the Germanic stress became (*verculum*<*verclum*<*vercl*<) *fercal.* *f* for Latin *v* in loan-words occurs frequently (cf. Latin *versus*<Old High German *vers* or *fers;* Braune, *Ahd. Gramm.* § 137, Anm. 2). For the secondary vowel *a* cf. goth. *fugls*<OHG. *fogal.*

Edward H. Sehrt.

Gettysburg College.

BRIEF MENTION

A few years ago professors of French were vying with one another in publishing elementary grammars. Now it is the turn of general histories of French literature. One of the most important of these is *A History of French Literature* by Kathleen T. Butler, New York, E. P. Dutton and Co., 2 vols. (1923). The author is widely read and displays both taste and a marked gift for exposition. The fact that she is an Englishwoman does not prevent her appreciating things French. She has wasted none of the 900 pages at her disposal. In short her book may be considered among the best histories of French literature in English, although it has certain faults that cannot be overlooked.

However large the nineteenth century may loom, the author is not justified in devoting to it half her work, nor do historians of the Romantic period deserve twice the space given to dramatists from Scribe to 1914. A more serious criticism lies in the fact that the reader who wishes to go farther than the author can take him is not shown whither to turn. Many of the critics cited are Englishman of small importance to the student of French literature and the lists of suggested readings appended to her two volumes omit many essential books and articles. Finally, there is a considerable amount of carelessness in detail. One is told, for instance, that Saint-Gelais introduced the sonnet into France (I, 120), that French pastoral plays before 1607 were based on Spanish models (I, 202), that Corneille's *Menteur* is a comedy of intrigue (I, 263), that his last plays are melodramas (I, 206), that Pellisson

was one of the founders of the French Academy (I, 216). It is misleading to assert that "in everything but religion Voltaire was a conservative" (I, 386), that Pixérécourt was "classical in form" (II, 9), that Chateaubriand visited "the wilder parts of America" (II, 19), that non-dogmatic criticism starts with Mme de Staël (II, 178), that *Monsieur Alphonse* has no human interest (II, 281), that Becque's characters are "all of a piece" (II, 285), that Porto-Riche "kept aloof" from the writers of the *Théâtre libre* (II, 286). Incorrect dates are given for the first part of the *Astrée* (I, 175), for *Sophonisbe, les Visionnaires, Polyeucte* and other plays (I, 175), 252, 206). Triboulet is presented with a son (II, 108), *Mélisande* with a rival (II, 322). There are numerous mistakes in the French, of which the most amusing is the thrice occurring *langue d'œil* for the speech of northern France (I, 5, 48). It is unfortunate that a book on which so much labor has been expended and which has so many excellent qualities was not submitted before publication to a number of specialists so that it might be made thoroughly satisfactory. In short it deserves a revision and an amplified bibliography. When the new edition appears, there should also be a revision in the price, for no rival author will wish to profit by the continuance of the present prohibitive charge of $9., which I can explain only as a misdirected effort on the part of the publisher to protect the American professor against English competition.

A much smaller book is Dr. Maxwell A. Smith's *Short History of French Literature,* New York, Henry Holt and Co. (1924), which is intended merely to guide undergraduates in their first grand tour. It succeeds in giving a generally correct account of important authors and tendencies, though some of the former (Marot, Montaigne, Becque) are not satisfactorily discussed, while others (Régnier, Retz, Saint-Simon) are omitted altogether. There are, moreover, such unfortunate mistakes as these: that Latin displaced Celtic throughout Gaul *except in Brittany* (p. 1); that Malherbe was a favorite of *Catherine* de Medici (p. 36); that, with the exception of the *Princesse de Clèves, Gil Blas, Candide,* and *Manon Lescaut,* "we find practically no attention paid to the genre of the novel before the appearance of Rousseau's *Julie*" (p. 211). If the author were better acquainted with the results of modern scholarship, he would not overlook Bédier's work on the *chansons de geste,* put the composition of *Gargantua* before that of *Pantagruel,* remark on the originality of Rabelais's educational ideas, repeat the discredited statement about de Chalons and the *Cid,* or the legends that Henriette d'Angleterre suggested the subject of *Bérénice* and that Lamartine did not correct his text. I doubt the wisdom of making such debatable statements as that English is a more poetic tongue than French (p. 1), that Racine's language is not only restricted, but artificial, or that Augier's

work has outlived that of Dumas *fils*. Certainly Lanson would be surprised to find himself described as a disciple of Brunetière. The last chapter will be of small assistance to a sophomore. It is a fifty page essay on living writers by Mlle Blanche Cognet which is not only out of proportion with the rest of the book, giving more space to Colette Willy than is elsewhere devoted to Mme de Sévigné, but which is translated by Dr. S. into such highly gallicized English that it has become, to use one of his phrases, utterly "inept at the expression of thought."

H. C. L.

Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic, interpreted from Representative Works. By Charles Sears Baldwin. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1924).

The rhetorical works of Aristotle and Cicero compressed into fifty-five pages; the teachings of Quintilian, Seneca the Elder, Tacitus, and Pliny concerning rhetoric in thirty-nine; and the critical treatises of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and The Great Unknown (Longinus) in twenty-nine: such is the digest made by Dr. Charles Sears Baldwin of Columbia University, preparatory to a further consideration of the views of representative ancient writers on poetics. This union of two linguistic lines in one work has been arranged in order to bring before the present generation of English students the best thought of antiquity on the "pro-progressive art of words." Aware of the severity of the process to which he has submitted the original treatises, the author frequently calls the attention of the reader to future works in which he will expand the subjects thus summarily treated. As guides for interested readers and for graduate students of rhetoric and poetic, selective references to numerous authorities and translations are given in the footnotes, the names of such scholars as Westermann, Spengel, Blass, Christ-Schmidt, Volkmann, and Norden being purposely omitted. The volume closes with a compressed tabular index of Greek and Latin rhetorical terms.

If one were to venture a prophecy, after reading Dr. Baldwin's summary, it would be this: In the renaissance of rhetoric which is manifesting itself by numerous oral and written courses in preparatory schools and colleges and by graduate work in universities, a stimulating touch of general scholarship has been given which will certainly be followed by numerous detailed treatises, such as that of Dr. D. L. Clark on *Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance,* Columbia University Press, 1922. With a suggestive text in hand students and teachers of vocal and written English will have access to that historic region which has been a *mare clausum* to them.

B. S.

Volume XL FEBRUARY, 1925 Number 2

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, Editor-in-Chief

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

CONTENTS

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year — Single Copy (Current) Sixty-five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

This publication is devoted to linguistic and literary research and to æsthetic and philosophic criticism in the domain of English, German, and the related Germanic Languages; and of French, Italian, Spanish, and the other Languages of the Romance Group. Its purpose is also to promote sound methods in the teaching of the Modern Languages and Literatures.

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00 for the United States and Mexico; Canada \$5.25 and \$5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union.

Contributors and Publishers will please address matter for the English Department of the *Notes* to James W. Bright; for the German Department to William Kurrelmeyer; for the French Department to H. Carrington Lancaster; for the Italian and Spanish Departments to Gustav Gruenbaum. Other matter may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief. The address of all the editors is Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

PREPARATION OF COPY

All copy should be in typewritten form.

Underscore (for italics) all titles of books, periodicals, poems, plays and other separately published compositions.

Use numerals in designating foot-notes, and number foot-notes in unbroken sequence.

Use roman numerals for volume-reference, set off by a comma before a following page-reference.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XL FEBRUARY, 1925 NUMBER 2

MEDIEVAL ICONOGRAPHY AND THE QUESTION OF ARTHURIAN ORIGINS.

Classic philologists have traditionally paid to classical archæology the tribute of serious consideration and study. Every competent student of Homer or of Pindar has known his Mycenaean excavations or his Greek vases as well as his texts. But it has been a singular fate of medieval studies in literature that they have been almost totally divorced from studies in archæology. The doctor of philosophy is expected to know the word for 'shield' in Gothic, Anglo-Saxon, Old French, Italian, Middle English, and what not. But who expects of him any exact knowledge of what a shield looked like at any given period or in any country? What classicist but knows the so-called Ludovisi throne or the frieze of the Parthenon? How many medieval philologists know the sculptures and stained glass of Chartres and the mosaics of St. Mark's and Monreale?

The year 1923 saw the publication of the medieval sections of two illustrated histories of French literature, one under the editorship of M. Bédier, the other of M. Lanson. Both are undertakings whose value I am the last to underestimate. Better than any previous undertakings of the kind, they furnish the student of the romances, chronicles, saints' lives, lyrics, and *chansons de geste* with material for the visual imagination to work upon. Here one may see, if not individual portraits of certain authors, at least the vivid portrayal of ideal author types. Here is Tintagel whose surge-beaten crags and broken battlements are haunted forever by the spirit of Romance. Here is the tower of Meung where Villon gnawed his fingers; here are the walls of Constantinople and of Tripoli which the "Franks" stormed more than once for love of Holy Sepulchre and in the hope of loot; here are the shrines of

Vézelay and Roncevaux and Meaux round which sprang up those clanging epics of Charlemagne and his peers. Here are scenes of legend, history, and drama as they lived in the dreams of their authors. Books such as these are as essential to the complete appreciation of medieval literature as are reproductions of Greek marbles and Roman triumphal arches to the complete appreciation of the ancient classics.

Yet the volumes of M. Bédier and M. Lanson, especially the latter, betray the lack of scholarly attention, not to speak of the supercilious carelessness, which is apt to characterise the attitude of the philologist toward medieval archaeology. M. Lanson is the chief offender. On p. 5 the transcript of the Oaths of Strasbourg is full of misreadings. On p. 23 we see two figures labeled "Roland et Olivier," but the rest of the caption tells us that they are the twins of the zodiac and not Roland and Oliver at all. On p. 34, we find a lady and a gentleman playing chess; that is all. The scene is one found frequently on ivories together with other courtly amusements. There is not the slightest basis for identifying these persons as Huon of Bordeaux and the daughter of the emir Sarrasini! On the next page the statement that the Davanzati frescoes are accompanied by "vers italiens" is incorrect. On p. 37 there is a tangle of errors. The picture reproduces a mosaic at Otranto. The sculpture which has been confused with it is not on the Doges' palace but on St. Mark's, Venice. The scenes from an ivory on p. 40 were identified by me in *Art in America,* v, 19 (1916). On the left Enyas rescues a damsel from an *homme sauvage* (cf. *Modern Philology,* XIV, 75 (1917)). On the right Galahad is admitted to the Castle of the Maidens. This panel and the others reproduced on pp. 40 and 41 belong to a casket in the Metropolitan Museum, New York. On p. 48 the mosaic referred to as destroyed still exists. Many of these errors would have been avoided by merely submitting the MS. to a competent archæologist for control.

There is also a matter of taste to be criticised. It seems unfortunate that so many works of the twelfth or thirteenth century are illustrated by fifteenth century illuminations. There is not the excuse that thirteenth century art was inferior; quite the contrary. Besides, a fifteenth century illustration of a *chanson de geste* seems almost as incongruous as a Roman general clad "cap-a-pie" in a suit of Gothic armor.

M. Bédier's volume is far less open to criticism on this score, but the illumination on p. 43 of the vision of the Grail is a ridiculous piece of inane posturing, as remote from the simple grace of the thirteenth century as could be. Let us be thankful that in the reproductions from the Yates Thompson MS. M. Bédier has made ample amends for this singular lapse of taste. It seems, moreover, unfortunate that when the romance of Tristram was more frequently illustrated than any other in medieval decorative art, the one illustration given by M. Bédier of this romance, which he has himself so beautifully interpreted and powerfully vitalized, should be one of the crudest of the many ivories which depict the tryst beneath the tree.

The most serious defect in the book is the treatment of the famous Arthurian sculpture at Modena, illustrated opposite p. 18. In the first place, the names are wrongly given in the accompanying text. Galvagin should read Galvagin*us*; Galvarium, Galvariun; Durmaltus, Burmaltus; Caradoc, Carrado. What should we think of a scholar who copied a text with such carelessness? On p. 18 one reads: "La date où ont étè executées les figures de la cathédrale de Modène est mal définie, et si certains archéologues la reculent jusqu'à l'année 1130, il est infiniment plus probable qu'il faut l'avancer jusqu'à l'année 1180." Here again appears that contempt for archæology as a science which seems to characterise the medieval philologist. M. Faral, to whom I believe this remark is to be credited, feels justified in sweeping aside the great bulk of archæological opinion on an archæological matter simply because it does not fit in with his own theory that almost all Arthurian romance derives from Geoffrey of Monmouth. To be sure, M. Mâle has lately given his sanction to the date 1160 for this sculpture, but he has not offered the slightest evidence for his opinion, and it has not been accepted, to my knowledge, by any other archæologist. Professors Bertoni and Toesca in Italy and Professors Porter and Morey in America, representing the highest expert opinion there is on the subject, concur in ascribing the sculpture to the early twelfth century. Professor Porter has done more; he has brought together a body of evidence of the strongest kind showing that this sculpture was done between 1099 and 1106. (Cf. A. K. Porter, *Lombard Architecture,* (1916) I, 269; II, 386; III, 44.) In an article to appear in *Medieval Studies in Memory of*

Gertrude Schoepperle Loomis, I have made some additional contributions to this evidence. The date 1099-1106 may be regarded as established. It will also be shown that the Modena sculptor heard the story in Bari from a *conteur* in the train of Breton Crusaders who spent there four months of the winter of 1096-7. The subject of the sculpture has likewise been discovered, viz., an early version of the Melwas-Medrot abduction of Guinevere, with Gawain as chief rescuer. The far-reaching implications of this discovery are to be worked out in a book which will tend to corroborate the theories of the Celtists and to explode the theories of Foerster. Naturally, when M. Faral says that "Dans la mesure où ceux-ci [la plupart des romans dits bretons] doivent quelque chose à une autre source que la seule imagination de leurs auteurs, ce n'est pas à des poèmes celtiques qu'ils se rattachent; c'est à une oeuvre de clerc," Geoffrey of Monmouth's *History of the Kings of Britain,* he makes himself a pitiful figure. It is after all a just retribution for his high-handed methods of dealing with archæological evidence that happened to be distasteful to him. But it is unfortunate that a work issued under such eminent auspices should give currency to utterly erroneous ideas concerning the Celtic foundations of Arthurian romance.

While correcting others I do not wish to spare myself. In my article in the *Romanic Review* (VIII, 196-209, 1917,) I declared (p. 205) that the Perceval casket at the Louvre was based on Crestien's *Perceval.* At the time Prof. A. C. L. Brown called my attention to the fact that the ivory carver represented Perceval as carrying two javelins instead of one, and that in this he seemed to be following a familiar Celtic practice. I did not then take the suggestion as seriously as it deserved, but the piling up of evidence by Miss Weston, Prof. Brown, Miss Williams, Dr. Griffith, M. Piquet, and others, to the effect that again and again supposed derivatives from Crestien's poems agreed among themselves as against Crestien, has brought the matter up once more. And I found that not only in this particular but also in another, the ivory casket clearly follows a more primitive tradition than that of Crestien.

In figure 6 Perceval appears carrying a bow, thus agreeing with Wolfram against Crestien. In figures 7 and 8 he carries two javelins. M. J. Loth pointed out long since that this was an ancient Celtic practice which has come down in the Irish and Welsh

legends (*Rev. Celt.,* XXVIII, 1907, 67). It is preserved in the Italian *Carduino,* long recognized as an analogue to the Perceval and Guiglain stories (*I Cantari di Carduino,* in *Poemetti Cavallereschi,* 1873, ed. Rajna, 5-7). Thus the casket agrees with the ancient Celtic tradition and with a cognate to the Perceval story in assigning two javelins to the hero as against Crestien, who gives him only one.

The other and perhaps more striking detail in which this casket departs from Crestien is the number of knights seen by Perceval in the forest. In Figure 6 only three appear. Crestien (l. 1315) mentions five. Now as Professor Brown, in an article in *Modern Philology,* XVI, 554 f. (1919) pointed out, *Sir Percyvelle,* Wolfram's *Parzifal,* and *Peredur* agree on the number three. The casket also depicts three. What conclusion should we draw? The casket does not in general correspond to any of these other versions, nor could it have followed any version greatly differing from Crestien. Obviously, therefore, there existed a full version of the Perceval story very close to Crestien but containing features more primitive than Crestien. Crestien himself says that Count Philip has bidden him "rimoier le meillor conte . . Qui soit contez an cort real; Ce est li contes del graal, Don li cuens li baille le livre." All the credit which Crestien claims for himself is that of turning into rhyme a *conte* which had been transcribed. This statement is definitely confirmed by the Louvre casket, since it shows that he followed closely a story similar to that used by the ivory carver, but yet not the same.

This and a multitude of other facts have convinced me that there were hundreds of versions of Arthurian legends, current before Crestien's time and after, which have not survived. I have therefore reconsidered my adhesion to the explanation of the Arthurian scenes on a certain type of ivory casket put forward by Antoniewicz in *Romanische Forschungen,* V, 241 (1890). Of course, the old identification of Tristan and Isolt beneath the tree holds good, and so, I believe, does my own identification of Galahad's arrival at the Castle of the Maidens, published in *Art in America,* V, 22 (1916). But I am doubtful whether the four scenes on the back, which Antoniewicz held to illustrate Crestien's *Lancelot* and *Perceval,* are not really based on some forgotten romance. First we have a knight cleaving the paws from a lion, which has fixed its claws in

the knight's shield; then we have the Sword Bridge; then the Perilous Bed; then the damsels who welcome the knight after the Perilous Bed adventure. Now in the *Lancelot* no lion combat precedes the crossing of the Sword Bridge; and in the *Perceval* a lion combat should intervene between the Perilous Bed episode and the welcome of the damsels. Antoniewicz believed that through some confusion in the model from which these caskets were copied, the lion combat had been misplaced. But since there is no other sign of such carelessness on the part of the designer and since we have already seen the possibility that other texts similar to Crestien's may have been used in these ivories, it seems more probable that the order of the incidents on the casket is due not to a carver's blunder, but to some literary source other than Crestien.

The archæological evidence, we see, corroborates the view that there was a vast quantity of Arthurian tradition afloat before Geoffrey and Crestien. Probably scholars who have only a superficial acquaintance with Celtic legend will continue to deny its affinity with French romance, and there will be others who will never be convinced that Crestien is not the source of *x* and *y* even though *x* and *y* agree against Crestien fifty times instead of five. But let them not think that they have any support in Iconography, for Iconography is a Celtist.

Columbia University. ROGER SHERMAN LOOMIS.

Mr. Loomis shows above that the Paris Casket refers to an older and more archaic Perceval story—doubtless to the source of Crestien's romance. This iconographic evidence is rendered complete by the fact that even an illustrator of Crestien's romance did not follow Crestien's text. A miniature in the Mons MS. of *Perceval* shows the hero carrying two short spears as on the Paris casket. What possible explanation of the two spears in this miniature can there be except the survival here of an older feature that rested upon Celtic practice?

Rotographs of certain pages of the Mons MS. have been procured at my request by the kindness of a committee of the Modern Language Association, and are at the Library of Congress. This miniature of Perceval carrying two javelins may be found on page 15, at the beginning of Crestien's part of the romance.

ARTHUR C. L. BROWN.

Northwestern University.

A SOURCE OF *SALAMMBÔ*

In the notes of the Conard edition of *Salammbô,* Mr. Abrami states that all the events of the terrific struggle between Carthage and the Barbarians are given in Polybius " Tout, sauf d'abord l'amour de Mathô pour Salammbô, c'est-à-dire précisément la raison d'être du livre." [1] As the development, in Flaubert's mind, of this fictitious part of the plot remained, then, still to be sought, the previous work of Flaubert has been examined with the hope of identifying some of the factors which have made possible the final creation of the story of Salammbô and Mathô. The part of *Anubis,* for example—that former project of Flaubert's literary imagination—in the formation of *Salammbô,* has been considered by Mr. Bertrand and by Mr. Blossom, and, most recently, by Mr. Benedetto.[2] An indication of the basis of the *Anubis* story is given in the correspondence of Flaubert of 1850,[3] but this sketch was not developed. However, Flaubert's intention to write of a woman who loved a god is not wholly abandoned, whatever differences the final form may show when compared to his original plan, for surely the central idea of an aspiration of human love for the divine has been incorporated into *Salammbô.* On the other hand, earlier critics mention a different parallel for a portion of the personal side of the novel, and the Goncourts suggest a Biblical source for a part of Flaubert's conception when they write:

> Je lis une traduction nouvelle de la Bible. C'est vraiment curieux la parenté du récit de Judith, allant trouver Holopherne, avec le récit de Salammbô, se rendant au camp de Mâtho.[4]

[1] *Salammbô,* Ed. Conard, 1910, pp. 416-417.

[2] L. Bertrand, *Gustave Flaubert,* 1912, p. 88; F. A. Blossom, *La Composition de Salammbô,* Elliot Monographs, No. 3, 1914, p. 52; L. F. Benedetto, *Le Origini di Salammbô,* 1920, p. 64.

[3] *Correspondance,* Ed. Conard, 1910, II, 12:—" A propos de sujets, j'en ai trois qui ne sont peut-être que le même, et ça m'embête considérablement. I. *Une Nuit de Don Juan* à laquelle j'ai pensé au lazaret de Rhodes. II. L'Histoire d'Anubis, la femme qui veut se faire aimer par le Dieu. . . . Ce qui me turlupine, c'est la parenté d'idées entre ces trois plans: Dans le premier, l'amour inassouvissable sous les deux formes de l'amour terrestre et de l'amour mystique. Dans le second, même histoire, mais on se donne et l'amour terrestre est moins élevé en ce qu'il est plus précis. . . . ."

[4] E. & J. Goncourt, *Journal,* 1879, VI, 87.

It is to be noted that Théophile Gautier, in the criticism of *Salammbô* written soon after its publication, had already called attention to this resemblance:

Salammbô, conseillée par Schahabarim, son directeur spirituel, essaye d'aller reprendre le voile de Tanit sous la tente de Mâtho, comme une autre Judith chez un autre Holopherne, et elle y réussit aux même conditions, sans couper la tête du Libyen, il est vrai.[5]

Can one, then, in addition to a revival of Flaubert's interest in the woman who loves a god, expect to discover in this novel the revealing of another preoccupation of Flaubert—the absorption in the Bible of which he spoke so frequently in his letters? It is interesting in this connection to examine the prevalence of the Biblical tale in contemporary artistic and literary surroundings. It may be noted, for example, that the appearance of Hebbel's *Judith* which had quickly made the author known throughout Germany, nearly coincided with that of an opera on the same subject by Madame Emile de Girardin. Her *Judith* was acted in Paris about the first of May, 1843, and two criticisms of it by Gautier, who was then Flaubert's master as he was later his friend, are of special interest. The second of Gautier's articles appeared in *l'Artiste* on May 10, 1857, and in it Gautier analyzed Madame de Girardin's *Judith* as follows:

Puis vinrent *Judith,* la meurtrière biblique, et Cléopâtre; Mademoiselle Rachel servit d'interprète à ces deux créations. *Judith* réussit faiblement, malgré des vers très purs et une idéé ingénieuse,—celle d'avoir supposé à l'heroïne juive un vague amour pour le général assyrien qu'elle a mission d'assassiner. . . .[6]

It is also to be noted that, according to Mr. Balde,[7] this "ingenious idea" of a vague love on the part of Judith for Holophernes (a love which finds its parallel in the story of Salammbô and Mathô) was to be found in the criticisms of Voltaire and Bayle of the Bible story, together with interpretations of Judith's visit to

[5] Th. Gautier, *Salammbô*, 22 décembre 1862, *l'Orient*, Ed. Charpentier, 1884, p. 312.

[6] Th. Gautier, *Galerie du XIXe Siècle: Madame Emile de Girardin*, in *L'Artiste*, May 10th, 1857.

[7] J. Balde, *Madame de Girardin*, 1913, p. 254.

the tent of Holophernes which may well be compared to the interpretations by contemporary critics of "Sous la tente."

The earlier criticism of Gautier is his compte-rendu for the first performance of Madame de Girardin's *Judith,* and its main interest lies in references to paintings of the same subjects:

Elle (Madame de Girardin) a cru que ce serait pour l'actrice comme une espece d'épopée nationale, et que celle-ci aurait plus de cœur à tuer Holopherne avec le grand damas que lui prêtent Raphael, Allori et Paul Véronèse que toute autre actrice chrétienne. . . . Le Costume du troisième acte est tout simplement de Raphael. . . .[8]

Later, one finds a reference by Gautier to the Judith of Horace Vernet, which was made use of for a "tableau vivant, à cadre," at the opéra.[9]

This evidence of contemporary preoccupation with the subject of Judith gives an indication of the impression which Flaubert's knowledge of it would be likely to make on him at that time and from his writings it is possible to obtain direct evidence of this knowledge. Flaubert knew and loved the Bible; even when he was devouring the edition of Cahan, his thoughts turned with pleasure to the Vulgate, which he had read continuously for at least three years.[10] He does not write directly of meditations on the theme of Judith, but when an examination is made of the *Notes de Voyages,* it is found that the subject received a great deal of consideration from him. In his trip of 1850 with Du Camp, for example, Flaubert noted and studied various renderings of the story:

Caravaggio—*Judith coupe la tête à Holopherne.*—Elle l'égorge comme un poulet, lui coupant le col avec son glaive, elle est calme et fronce seulement le sourcil de la peine qu'elle a. Judith a une robe bleue. Le sang (vrai noir, rouge brun et non pas rouge pourpre comme d'ordinaire) coule sur le matelas. Tableau très féroce et d'une vérité canaille.[11]

Christophano Allori—*Judith tenant la tête d'Holopherne*—Une servante à côté. Admirable petite toile. . . .

---

[8] Th. Gautier, Compte-rendu de *Judith,* 3 mai 1843, *l'Art dramatique en France,* 1858-59, III, 45-46.

[9] *Ibid.,* IV, 368.

[10] *Correspondance,* I, 258-259; II, 127, 153.

[11] *Notes de Voyages,* "Italie, Naples, Musée Borbonico, 1850," Ed. Conard, 1910, II, 192.

La Judith est bien belle, paupières épaisses, visage plein de volupté et de hardiesse.

Artemiso Lomi—*Judith égorgeant Holopherne*—C'est le même tableau qui est à Naples sous le nom du Caravaggio.[12]

Allori—*Judith tenant la tête d'Holopherne à la main*—est le même en grand que le petit qui est aux Offices.[13]

But his account of the painting of Titian, which he saw during his *Voyage en famille* of 1845 (during which, it will be recalled, he first saw the painting of Breughel which gave form to the *Tentation de Saint Antoine*) is most informative:

Judith et Holopherne (Titien)—Judith, coiffure presque Pompadour, met la tête d'Holopherne dans un sac que lui présente sa suivante, négresse. . . . Elle vient de tuer, l'effort est passé, elle est calme, tranquille. Souvenons-nous du calme de Lorenzaccio, dans la pièce d'Alfred de Musset; dans le tableau de Steuben, elle rêve, elle marche a son entreprise, elle est triste; dans celui de Vernet, elle l'exécute, elle est emportée. Quelle est de ces trois situations celle que j'aurais choisie, de ces trois femmes quelle est la plus belle? La plus jolie, comme joli, c'est celle de Steuben, celle que l'on aimerait le mieux à . . . , c'est celle de Vernet, celle que l'on admire le mieux, c'est celle de Véronèse: c'est peut-être la supérieure, en tout cas, c'est la conception la plus hardie des trois. La manière toute bête dont elle met la tête d'Holopherne dans le sac n'est pas sortie d'un artiste vulgaire qui eût voulu faire de l'inspiré, de l'animé, du mouvementé, comme au premier abord le sujet d'un tel fait semble le demander. Belle histoire que celle de Judith, et que, dans des temps plus audacieux, moi aussi, j'avais rêvé.[14]

In 1872, this subject was again present in his mind, when, in *Saint Antoine,* he made the Lord God of Israel speak of exploits such as Judith's as part of the history of his religion.[15] Taking into consideration the contemporary interest and Flaubert's own preoccupation with the story it would not, then, be beyond proba-

[12] (II) *Ibid.,* "Florence," p. 274.

[13] *Ibid.,* p. 282.

[14] *Notes de Voyages,* "Voyages en famille, Gênes, 1845." Ed. Conard, I, 25.

[15] *La Tentation de Saint Antoine* (1872), Ed. Charpentier, 1890, p. 244:—"Parfumées de nard, de cinnamome et de myrrhe, avec des robes transparentes et des chaussures à talon haut, des femmes à cœur intrépide allaient égorger les capitaines. . . . "

bility to conceive of *Judith* as a basis for the very similar episode in *Salammbô.*

Such a conception seems to become quite justifiable on examination of the two stories. It is of interest to note, in the first place, that the original scenario of *Salammbô* does not contain the idea of *Anubis,* that in it the daughter of Hamilcar is not desirous of the knowledge of Tanit. Rather, her resemblance to the Biblical Judith,—with, perhaps, the addition of the trait of vague love which has already been adjoined in France,—is marked. The scenario reads:

> La jeune fille prend, après mille luttes, la résolution de sauver la ville, en reprenant le voile—elle y retouchera, elle mourra, mais Carthage *sera sauvée par une femme.* Elle ne met dans sa confidence que quelques serviteurs fidèles—elle part pour le camp des Mercenaires—elle entre—joie de Mâtho. . . .[16]

To this should be compared the emphasis in the prayers and thanksgivings which were occasioned by the expedition of Judith:

> Abats leur élévation par la main d'une femme.[17]
> Le seigneur tout-puissant les a frustrés de leurs entreprises *par la main d'une femme.* . . .[18]
> Judith, fille de Mérari, l'a défait *par la beauté de son visage.*[19]

A comparison of *Judith* with *Salammbô* in its final form tends to confirm the hypothesis that a memory of the former story was present in the mind of Flaubert at the time of his conception of Salammbô. Each of the heroines is urged to save her country and, after consenting to the mission, makes secret preparation for the journey. Salammbô, like Judith, goes through preliminary religious rites and then puts on ceremonial clothing and decks herself with jewels. Special food is prepared for each journey. Judith meets the first watch of the Assyrians and tells them that she, a woman of the race of the Hebrews, has fled from them and wishes to present herself to Holophernes. Salammbô also is stopped by a sentinel and, as a refugee from Carthage, demands speech with Mâtho. Even the setting of the tent is similar: Salammbô sees

[16] *Salammbô,* Ed. Conard, 1910, *Notes,* p. 469.

[17] *La Sainte Bible, Livres apocryphes,* Ed. David Martin, Montauban, 1823, *Judith,* IX, 14.

[18] *Ibid.,* XVI, 7.

[19] *Ibid.,* XVI, 8.

on a bed the *zaimph,* bluish and shining; she seizes a dagger from the head of the bed and starts to kill Mâtho; in the end, she escapes with the *zaimph* from the camp of the Barbarians. Judith, in her adventure, kills Holophernes after taking his scimitar from the pillar of the bed and she, too, takes with her from the besieging camp the *pavillon* which covers the bed of Holophernes and which was woven of purple and gold and emeralds and precious stones. The results of the adventures, again, were similar, for both Judith and Salammbô were greeted in their cities by stunned silence and then by the people's acclamation, while both encampments were thrown by their success into a confusion of shouting and storm.

There is in the two stories a great similarity of details of ceremony, of apparel, etc., as well as of action. The emphasis in them is naturally different: the Biblical writer had to dwell on the beauty of Judith to account for the success of her mission, while Flaubert had already in earlier chapters justified the influence of Salammbô on Mâtho. On the other hand the extended description of the camp in *Salammbô* was necessitated by a complexity of plot, not found in the Bible story. It would seem, then, justifiable to allot to *Judith* a place among the sources of Flaubert's novel.

Millburn, N. J. LOUISE B. DILLINGHAM.

SCHRECKE LÄUTEN

In certain Suabian regions the expression *Schrecke läuten* is used for a special ringing of the bells, usually in the afternoon or the night before Christmas, occasionally on the eve also of other high feasts, in some districts for weddings. At present it seems to mean in most places a general festal ringing of all the bells, in some places a ringing of all bells three times, or with three intervals. Various popular customs are connected with this ringing. Fischer's *Schwäbisches Wörterbuch* gives the fullest and most recent information about this use of *Schrecke.* There is however no mention there of its earliest known occurrence. This seems to be in the St. Blasien liturgical manuscript of the fourteenth century of which Gerbert has reprinted large portions in Part III of his *Monumenta Veteris Liturgiae Alemannicae.* Here is stated

(p. 226) that, after the monks have been aroused for Christmas matins, "Accensis luminibus, pulsetur scilla cum duabus parvis campanis, quae compulsatio vulgariter dicitur *Schreki.* Postea fiat compulsatio in choro tantum cum illis campanis, deinde exeant de choro Diaconi et Conversi, et maiores campanae et duo signa maxima pulsentur. Venientibus vero pueris et factis tribus orationibus duo signa pulsentur unumquodque cum duabus campanis, postea omnia, et sic fiat compulsatio in omnibus festivitatibus." A second mention, under 'Quando Campanae pulsandae,' is found on page 244: "Hora matutinali eat Secretarius in dormitorium et excitet de Fratribus quos voluerit et incipiat sonare duabus parvis scillis ad matutinum: Postea fiat compulsatio ab omnibus campanis in choro, quae compulsatio dicitur terracio, quae vulgariter dicitur *Schreki.*" These two passages give somewhat conflicting and apparently somewhat inaccurate statements as to what was called *Schrecke.* All evidence points to its having always had a festal significance and it seems impossible to refer it, as the first passage does, simply to the introductory ringing of two small bells. The Bavarian evidence which I shall offer will establish a probability that the St. Blasien folk applied their vernacular *Schrecke läuten* to the whole series of festal ringings, two by two and then all, which the first passage describes; it is thus also probable that the second passage is wrong in applying it to a single ringing of all the bells in the choir.

In several liturgical manuscripts of the State Library in Munich, from various Bavarian monasteries, I have come upon the expression *terrores pulsare,* an interesting Latinization of *Schrecke läuten* and an idiom not to be found in any of the dictionaries of medieval Latin. The following passage from clm. 12018, a manuscript of the Benedictine monastery of St. George at Prüfening, written probably in the second half of the fifteenth century, gives clearly the how and when of *Schrecke läuten* in that monastery: (f. 161ᵛ) "De ceremoniis in summis festivitatibus observandis. . . In priori vespera et ad nocturnos terrores pulsantur, primo cum omnibus campanis, deinde bine et bine a minoribus inchoando, itemque in fine singule[1] compulsantur campane. . . . In secundis autem vesperis fit pulsus per omnia ut in priori vespera,

[1] *Singule* here as in several places in the manuscript is used in the

terroribus demptis, exceptis tribus principalibus dominicalibus festis, videlicet nativitatis et resurrectionis et penthecostes." From this, as from several other passages in the manuscript, it is clear that in the ringing of *terrores* the bells were first rung all together, then two by two, and then again all together. We see also that *terrores* were rung at second vespers only on the three highest Dominical feasts, and that the term *terrores* was not used of the single ringing of all the bells at second vespers on the other high feasts. To be sure, the following passage shows *pulsantur terrores* used of single ringings, but only as parts of the whole complex: (f. 90^r) "In priori vespera bis pulsantur terrores cum duabus maioribus campanis, deinde omnia signa more consueta." This passage describes a slightly more elaborate ringing of *terrores* which occurred at first vespers on two feasts of special local importance, the feast of St. George, after whom the monastery was named, and the anniversary of the dedication of the monastery church. The "deinde omnia signa more consueta" means the usual *terrores,* as is more clearly expressed in the directions for the other of these two special occasions (f. 124^v).

This ringing of *terrores* at vespers and matins of certain feasts I have found mentioned also in three fifteenth-century manuscripts of the monasery of St. Emmeram in Regensburg, one of which was written in 1435, and in an Indersdorff manuscript of the year 1481. Although the usual expression in these is "pulsantur terrores cum omnibus campanis," it is practically certain that it meant in these cases also a festal complex of ringings; in the Prüfening manuscript this same abridged expression is usually found in the directions for the individual highest feasts where it is clear from the passage above that it means the usual series. In Indersdorf the prematutinal *terrores* of Easter came immediately after the so-called *Elevatio Crucis.* In publishing this ceremony some years ago Professor Karl Young, who was naturally unfamiliar with this local Latinization, was puzzled by the abbreviation *t'rores* (Postea statim pulsentur t'rores ad matutinum) and was unable to expand it.[2]

sense of *omnes;* in a practically identical description of *terrores pulsare* before matins on Easter (f. 74^v) an original *singule* has been crossed out and *omnes* written in by the same hand.

[2] *Transactions of Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters,* Vol. XVI, Part II, p. 905.

In its modern use *Schrecke läuten* is in most places limited to Christmas night or the afternoon before, and the various attempts to explain the expression, while relating it naturally to the verb *schrecken,* brings it usually into connection with some of the popular Christmas customs,—a ringing to startle or arouse the people to go to church or to hasten to the fields and bind straw about the trees, or a ringing to arouse the sleeping live stock that was fed at midnight on Christmas. Fischer says in his *Schwäb. Wb.:* "Da das Läuten in der Christnacht altbezeugt ist, ist von diesem auszugehen." But by the evidence here presented the ringing on other high feasts is also 'altbezeugt,' and it does not seem to have been originally more characteristic of one feast than another.

It is noteworthy that in the Latin expression the plural *terrores* is always used. This rendering of *Schrecke* by *terrores* seems convincing evidence that *Schrecke* is, or originally was, plural, the plural of the strong masculine *Schreck* (*terror*), a plural of which Schmeller's *Bayerisches Wörterbuch* gives examples in other expressions. Fischer however gives the *Schrecke* of our idiom as a different word from *Schrecke* and as a feminine singular, from which I infer that in the modern Suabian dialects it is felt as a singular. But if in Bavarian it was originally plural, it was probably also originally plural in Suabian.[8] If this is so, Fischer's derivation is in need of correction. He says it is a feminine derivative of the verb *schrecken,* expressing "das Mittel zum Schrecken," just as *die Bicke,* Suabian for wagon-brake, is a feminine from *bicken,* to brake. Furthermore, if *Schrecke* is an older strong plural of *der Schrecke,* there would be need of revising the statement which Fischer makes under *Schreck*(*en*): "Bei uns kommt man mit schw. m. Schreck(en) durch, während sonst noch st. *Schreck* und n. *Schrecken* hinzuzunehmen ist."

NEIL C. BROOKS.

University of Illinois.

---

[8] The Latin singular *terracio* of the St. Blasien MS. can hardly be considered significant in view of the evidence already mentioned of the author's apparently imperfect understanding of the vernacular expression.

BODMER'S BORROWINGS FROM AN ITALIAN POET

In a manner reminding one somewhat of the German poet Novalis, the Italian Thomas Ceva (1648-1737) combined a fondness and aptitude for mathematics with a genuine love and marked capacity for poetry. His neo-Latin epic *Jesus Puer,*[1] written in a Roman Catholic spirit, possesses merits both as to the idyllic and the heroic vein, which were recognized even by Lessing. This poem represents another source of Bodmer's *Noah* to be added to those which I have previously discussed.

One of the most striking pieces of epic machinery in Bodmer's *Noah* is his marvelous airship. This device, as I shall show, he borrowed, and borrowed moreover from none other than Ceva. In the *Jesus Puer* there occurs in canto three a passage where the muse is besought to tell of the hordes which have been conveyed from the remotest regions of Asia on strange ships which came sailing through the air.[2]

In a more important reference to this same episode we learn the following. Dissension and violence have broken out among the satanic hosts. Suddenly, to the amazement of all, there arrives, as if borne high upon the backs of black clouds, a mighty aerial fleet of innumerable larger and smaller aircraft. And this fleet, as we read, makes its successful landing in this wise:

> "Illa rotis se circinat aëre magnis
> Paulatim ad terras spiris ingentibus acta,"

which certainly strikes one as a remarkable poetical anticipation of a familiar twentieth century achievement. The poet devotes a portion of the passage to a brief description of the people on board

[1] The title as well as the poem itself probably inspired the suggestion which Bodmer made to Wieland that he write an epic *Der Knabe Jesus.* Mörikofer did not suspect the connection; cf. his *Die Schweizerische Literatur des 18. Jahrhunderts*, p. 194-5. So far as I am aware, Bodmer's friend Klopstock, though he probably knew Ceva's poem, shows no influence from that source in his *Messias.* In this matter, I am inclined to agree with Muncker; cf. his *Über einige Vorbilder für Klopstocks Dichtungen* in the reports of the Königl. Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften (1908), No. 6, p. 30 f.

[2] Cf. l. 324-325.

and at the same time gives us also a glimpse of the cargoes which include monstrous birds, apes, satyrs and fauns.[3]

Here indeed was something quite after the heart of Bodmer. For the marvelous, one may well say, he ever cherished an almost child-like fondness; or, to speak more accurately, to him the strange, the exotic, the novel represented subjects preëminently suited for poetic treatment; in fact in his theory of poetry, in which against Gottsched he valiantly and successfully championed the rights of the imagination, he assigned to such themes a distinct priority over other matters. Ceva's fleet is clearly the prototype of Bodmer's airship, and even the Italian poet's demons on board have their counterpart in the "Geister des Abgrunds" who man Bodmer's aerial warship. From the *Noah*[4] I cite the following passage. The Giant, Andramalech, speaks:

Wohlan dann,
Lasset uns einmal versuchen, ob unsre Kräfte noch ganz sind!
Glaubet ihr mir, so wird jetzt von uns ein Kriegsschiff erbauet,
Und mit Giganten besetzt, und Wolken werden gesammelt,
Die ihm untergelegt in dem fliessenden Luftpfad es tragen;
Dann ists ein leichtes mit flatternden Schwingen die Luft zu erschüttern,
Dass wir mit vollen Segeln die Seiten des Berges erreichen.
Seine Worte gefielen. Sie flogen das Werk zu vollführen.
Und nicht lang', so stieg aus der Luft ein Kriegsschiff herunter,
Mit erhabenen Masten, mit Steuer, mit Kammern und Sälen
. . . .
Auf dem Soller erblickte man fremde Gestalten von Kriegern
In helleuchtender Rüstung.

And then, corresponding to the *descent* of Ceva's aerial fleet, Bodmer presents a somewhat more detailed account of the *ascent* of his airship in the following words:

Jetzo hoben sich unter dem Kiel die fliessenden Wolken;
Langsam fuhren sie erstlich in einer schief schlängelnden Schnecke
. . . .
Als es jetzt hoch in der Luft, den Seiten des steigenden Berges[5]
Eben gleich stand, so ergossen dahin sich strömend die Wolken
Breit und gerade, dann spannten die neuen ätherischen Schiffer

[3] Cf. *Jesus Puer*, III, 424 ff.
[4] Cf. the edition of 1765, p. 144 f.
[5] Their objective point.

Alle Segel auf einmal aus, um den Wind zu empfangen,
Den in dem Rücken des Schiffes nicht gesehne Flügel erschufen.[6]
(*Noah*, p. 145)

In depicting the disastrous fate of this strange craft, however, Bodmer, as I hope to show elsewhere, turns again, as was his wont, to his indispensable Milton for further welcome suggestions.[7] So much for the airship.

Bodmer's account of Eve's experience at the placid lake is likewise a composite being indebted both to Milton and to Ceva. The Miltonian lines in question I shall reserve for another occasion; the passage in the *Jesus Puer* is the following. Eve, when she beholds her own image in the water, at first turns to see whether this be not the reflection of someone behind her. Then, as we read:

Bis mersit furtiva manum, si forte sub undis
Altera virgo foret, stagno quae pulchra lateret.
(*Jesus Puer*, IV, 208 f.)

Of this passage the following lines represent Bodmer's imitation:

Hier sah sie in den wässernen Spiegel, da sah sie sich selber,
Streckte voll Liebe den Arm aus, ihr eigenes Bild zu ergreifen,
Aber ergriff nur Wasser, das Bild war im Wasser verloren.
(*Noah*, p. 157)

Bodmer in the *Noah* introduces a historical reminiscence of the Eve of St. Bartholomew and there represents the two contending parties as "die Blauen" and "die Grünen." In Ceva's epic we likewise read of two hostile parties, each of which uses a color as its watchword

Causa mali geminae perplexa ab origine partes,
Queis bicolor nomen fatalis tessera belli.
(*Jesus Puer*, VI, 37 f.)

Though this passage probably had a certain suggestive influence upon the Bodmerian conception, the specific colors blue and green, as party emblems, undoubtedly trace back to the occasion of the civil war in Constantinople at the time of Emperor Justinian.[8]

For the prophetic tapestries, of which we find repeated mention in the *Noah*, there were probably several contributing sources, one

[6] That Bodmer was far from being a scientist, appears from his naive conception of a ship under sail capable of producing its own propelling wind.

[7] The airship is also referred to in the *Noah* on pp. 170, 171, 173, and elsewhere.

[8] A brief account of this conflict may be found on p. 102 of Bémont and

of them being Ceva's use of a similar device in his epic.[9] As in the case of the Bodmerian tapestries on the walls of the ark, the painted scenes in the *Jesus Puer* represent future events both of secular and ecclesiastical history; of the latter we find particularly the future passion of Christ anticipated.[10]

Bodmer was fond of indicating lapse of time by reference to the course of the sun. Examples like the following illustrate this usage:

> Heute wälzt sich die funfzigste Sonn' um die Stunden des Mittags [11]

and again

> Ehe die vierte Sonne . . . .
> . . . . die Stirne der Aurora entfärbet hatte.[12]

Bodmer's contemporary Schönaich in the *Neologisches Wörterbuch* [13] cites from the earlier edition of the *Noah:* [14]

> Fünfzig Sonnen war Noah schon mit dem Engel abwesend

a line which provokes the following characteristic and, at the same time, revealing, comment: "Wie lange ist das? Gehet alle Jahre eine neue Sonne auf? *Rath Bodmer* glaubet vielleicht, wie einige Völker, dass alle Tage eine neue Sonne aufgehe." The poets have, of course, long been given to the practice of indicating the passage of time by reference to the movement of the heavenly bodies whether of the sun, the moon or the stars. This manner of measuring time, which extends back to classical usage, prevailed also during the seventeenth century renaissance where we find examples in Opitz, Ronsard and others.[15] Ceva too, conformable to the practice, says, for example,

> Adsum, inquit [*sc.* Jonas], Memphi digressus longa viarum
> Post spatia, et soles terdenos.[16]

Monod's *Medieval Europe*, translated from the French by Mary Sloan. Baechtold in his *Deutsche Lit. der Schweiz*, p. 473, points out a similar use of colors as party designations in Gottsched's *Parisische Bluthochzeit;* this drama was not accessible to me.

[9] Among other possible, or rather probable, sources, the tapestries in the palace at Carthage (cf. Virgil's *Aeneid*, I) may be referred to. There also come to mind the curtain and the reliefs (cf. Virgil's *Georgics*, III, 25 ff.) upon both of which are depicted future historical events. Moreover, the visions of the future which old Anchises sets before Aeneas (*Aeneid*, VI) probably had some influence upon the prophetic visions in the *Noah* as they also had upon *Paradise Lost*.

[10] Cf. *Jesus Puer*, VI. [11] Cf. the *Noah*, p. 17. [12] *Ibid.*, p. 209.

[13] Cf. p. 332. [14] Cf. the edition of 1752, I, 36.

[15] Cf. Rich. Beckherrn: *Opitz, Ronsard, und Heinsius*, p. 72 f.

[16] Cf. *Jesus Puer*, I, 87 f.

One point more in conclusion. Ceva's poem has its successful idyllic pictures which, like the scenes of this type in *Paradise Lost*, probably suggested and indeed helped to shape such scenes in the *Noah;* this is the more likely since Bodmer, along with his characteristic predilection for the marvelous, betrays also an unmistakable innate fondness for the idyllic both in life and in literature.

University of Iowa. C. H. IBERSHOFF.

MR. JOHN MASEFIELD: A BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

About a year ago, having in hand the writing of a short sketch of Mr. John Masefield's work for an anthology, I met unexpected difficulty in ascertaining definitely the simplest facts about his life. Without appending a list of all the errors and inconsistencies which I found in books of reference,[1] I will merely record that the date of Mr. Masefield's birth was variously given as 1874, 1875, and 1878; the place as Shropshire, Ledbury in Herefordshire, and "the west of England"; the scenery of his earlier poetry as Shropshire, Gloucestershire, and Herefordshire; and, in a number of books, the date of his coming to America as 1902—at variance with his own declaration.[2]

In a strain, rather unusual in him, of mildly humorous self-consciousness, Mr. Masefield has foretold how his future biographer will reduce all his thoughts and actions "to lists of dates and facts" and how all these will then be forgotten.

> And none will know the gleam there used to be
> About the feast days freshly kept by me,
> But men will call the golden hour of bliss
> "About this time," or "shortly after this."
>
> (From *Biography*)

These convenient connectives, one finds, are largely employed about him now;—in the presence of so many conflicting assertions, how else can one make one's paragraph? My own account [3] was as bad in this respect as most of the others. By saying that he

[1] An honorable exception, Mr. Louis Untermeyer's note in *Modern British Poetry* (Harcourt, 1920) proved to be both explicit and correct—except that Herefordshire was misprinted Hertfordshire.

[2] *Poems and Plays*, 1918, Vol. I, Preface, p. vi.

[3] In G. R. Elliott and Norman Foerster's *English Poetry of the Nineteenth Century* (Macmillan, 1923), p. 813.

was born "c. 1875" and "grew up in the West of England," I thought that I had achieved a respectable scholarly vagueness on these points. The publishers, however, who are also Mr. Masefield's publishers, insisted on changing my date to 1874, which I felt sure but could not prove to be wrong. It is, then, to correct myself as well as others that the present brief statement is offered.

Masefield was born at the house known as "The Knapp" in Ledbury, Herefordshire, on June 1, 1878. I ascertained the fact by consulting the town records. In the register of births his Christian names are given as John Edward; his father's name and profession as George Edward Masefield, Solicitor; and his mother's maiden name as Caroline Louisa Parker. The mother's death is recorded as of January 20, 1885. The father's death, which occurred not long after, I did not find recorded at Ledbury. After the death of the parents the Masefield children were taken to their aunt's home, The Priory, in Ledbury, and there they grew up. In an article appearing in another publication, I have dealt with the scenery of Ledbury as an element in Masefield's first narrative poems, especially *The Everlasting Mercy*.

Masefield must have been just barely or not quite fourteen years old when he left Ledbury for his training ship, the *Conway*. That would accord with his own statement about the event and with the deductions that may be drawn from Miss Nicholl's careful article, referred to in the next paragraph. The statement made by Professor William Lyon Phelps [4] and others, and widely credited, that he ran away to sea, is without foundation. It would be nearer the truth (though still untrue) to say that he ran away *from* sea. After his period of training on the *Conway* and a year regularly at sea, Masefield, who had suffered a slight touch of sunstroke, obtained permission to leave the service, and, when not yet seventeen years of age, he gave up the sea for good.

Of his two years in Yonkers, with their rich delights of literature, I can do no better than refer the reader to the important article by Miss Louise Townsend Nicholl in the (New York)

[4] In "The Advance of English Poetry in the Twentieth Century," Part III, *Bookman*, December, 1917 (later issued in book form with the same title).—Very soundly, Professor Phelps emphasizes the absurdity of supposing (as many do) "that the Ledbury boy was an uncouth vagabond, who, without reading, without education, and without training, suddenly

Bookman for January, 1919. She gives a coherent and seemingly accurate account of Masefield's movements from the time he left his ship in New York harbor on the 9th or 10th day of April, 1895, to his departure for England on July 4th, 1897. She gathered and recorded the impressions of the people in Yonkers with whom the young Masefield was most intimate, and she printed three sonnets (two serious and one jocose) which he wrote at this time and which his friends had saved. Altogether, Miss Nicholl's article should prove very valuable to the future biographer, and it is extremely interesting to the contemporary reader. One may learn from it how very incidental was that unduly celebrated episode, the young Englishman's employment for a short time as bartender.

The record of the next few years is not yet filled out. Apparently, he came to London, where, Mr. W. H. Hamilton[5] tells us, he settled in Bloomsbury and made friends with J. M. Synge.[6] "Shortly after this," in one of the formulas of *Biography,* he was for six months on the staff of the *Manchester Guardian.* Of his relations with fellow-workers while in this employment, we are told by the same authority that his "reserve was invulnerable"; he declined their intimacy but gained their respect. Then he returned to London, to tackle literary work more seriously. A list of his writings is given in Mr. Iolo Aneurin Williams's bibliography.[7] *The Everlasting Mercy,* appearing in the *English Review* for October, 1911, put him into the front rank among contemporary poets. In the following year the Royal Society of Literature awarded him the Edmond de Polignac prize for poetry. The growth of his reputation through subsequent books, his non-combatant service on the Western front, his lecture tour in America in 1916, and his writing of *Gallipoli*[8] are too recent and too familiar

became a poet. He had a good school education before going to sea; and from earliest childhood he longed to write . . . during all the years of bodily toil, afloat and ashore, he had the mind and the aspirations of a man of letters."

[5] In his *John Masefield: a critical study,* London, 1922.

[6] See Masefield's article on Synge, *Contemporary Review,* April, 1911.

[7] *Bibliographies of Modern Authors, No. 2, John Masefield,* compiled by I. A. Williams (London, Leslie Chaundy and Company; New Haven, The Brick Row Book Shop, Inc.), 1921.

[8] For the circumstances under which it was written, see the Preface to the second (1923) edition.

to need recounting. He had been married in 1903, and a son and a daughter had been born. A pleasant glimpse of the family life is afforded by Mr. John Cournos's narrative [9] of his visit at the Masefields' house in 1912, when they were living in the village of Great Hampden, Buckinghamshire. The article is chiefly interesting, however, for its indications of Mr. Masefield's intellectual interests at that time and for some of his literary judgments and observations which it records.

Perhaps the only serious misconception about Masefield's career, to which the various misstatements of fact have led, is the impression that he was nearly thirty years old before poetry, so to speak, took hold of him. For this mistaken notion, I am afraid, we must hold Professor Manly and Miss Rickert in some measure responsible; for their account,[10] which unfortunately commits all the errors previously specified (that he was born in 1874, in Shropshire,—which furnishes the scenery of his early poems,—ran away, came to America *in 1902,* and *thereupon* first applied himself with passion and system to the reading of poetry), has been followed by a number of later books of wide circulation. This combination of two incorrect dates results, as will be seen, in a picture of Masefield undergoing his initiation into poetry at the age of twenty-eight, whereas it was really a boy of eighteen who made his appearance in William Palmer East's bookshop in Yonkers and impressed the proprietor with that "faint sense of the unusual and the compelling about him." So much could have been learned from Miss Nicholl's article, which is duly listed in the Manly-Rickert manual; that the date of the plunge into Chaucer was 1896, not 1902, is stated, indeed, by Masefield himself in the Preface to the collected *Poems and Plays.* The importance of the fact need not be dwelt upon. Professor Manly and Miss Rickert, I am sure, would be the first to acknowledge that it makes considerable difference whether we think of a man of letters as beginning at eighteen or at twenty-eight. It seems worth while to attempt to check the further spreading of this error concerning one of the chief contemporary poets.

Union College. STANLEY P. CHASE.

[9] In the *Independent* for September 5, 1912.

[10] In *Contemporary British Literature: Bibliographies and Study Outlines,* by J. M. Manly and Edith Rickert, 1922, p. 111.

TERESA BLOUNT AND "ALEXIS"

Among the letters to Martha and Teresa Blount preserved by the Blount family at Mapledurham House near Reading, and well known as Popeiana, is a series of some twenty-five written during 1713,[1] in which the author addresses the two sisters as Parthenissa and Zephylinda and signs himself Alexis. Only one of these letters is superscribed to Martha; the rest were Teresa's. Among them also is a single letter in another hand from "Alexander" to Parthenissa. The staple of these letters is society gossip from London seasoned with much silly amorous chatter—perfunctory and conventional, and obviously intended merely for amusement—and with occasional excursions into the risque, not unlike Pope's in his correspondence with the two sisters.

Editors of Pope have unhesitatingly ascribed these letters to James Moore-Smythe, and earlier ones were even able to find in them a perfectly satisfactory explanation for Pope's savage attacks on him in *The Dunciad* and elsewhere. William Lisle Bowles says, inaccurately enough, that Teresa under the name of Zephylinda, corresponded with James Moore *for some years,* and maintains that "this accounts more than anything else for Pope's inveteracy to him. James Moore had robbed him of Teresa as Lord Hervey afterward did of his idol, Lady Mary."[2] Later students of Pope, having noted that there was a lapse of a dozen years between the letters and Pope's squabble with Moore-Smythe, and that in the meantime the two men had been friends, have been unable to accept this interesting motivation of Pope's animosity, but have gone on recording the fact that Moore-Smythe and Teresa Blount corresponded romantically under the names of Zephylinda and Alexis. Carruthers, who says, fifty years after Bowles, that he was the first student of his time to gain access to the Mapledurham papers, declares that throughout the year 1713 Moore-Smythe wrote "sentimental fopperies" to the Blount sisters, as their "poetical attendant and correspondent."[3] The only suggestion of doubt as to the

[1] A few of the letters are undated, but they all seem to belong to the one sequence.

[2] Works of Pope, 1806, I, XLVII.

[3] *Life of Pope,* 2nd ed., 1857, pp. 71, 438-440. The Alexander letter re-

authorship of the Alexis letters seems to be in C. W. Dilke's expression of a hope that the new editors [Elwin and Courthope] "will perhaps . . . tell us what truth there was in the stories about Zephylinda and Alexis, Teresa Blount and James Moore-Smythe."[4]

Had these various scholars ever happened to consider the date of Moore-Smythe's birth, they would never have done him the doubtful honor to believe him the author of these letters. James Moore, who later took his maternal grandfather's name of Smythe, was born, according to the records of Oxford, in 1702. He had, therefore, reached the tender age of eleven when Alexis was sending down into the country to a Zephylinda of twenty-five, missives of "sentimental foppery" and scandalous gossip — stuff such as no child of eleven, however precocious, could conceivably have written. Alexis was apparently a beau who spent his time in those fashionable amusements which he describes at first hand, and who says in one of his letters (July 30), "I was some hours with Mr. Pope yesterday, who has, to use his own words, a mighty respect for the two Miss Blounts."

On searching for reasons why Alexis is identified with Moore-Smythe, one finds that none are offered. There is a mere statement of the fact, repeated by each editor or critic, and that is all. One of the letters, however, furnishes a clue. An undated note, written by Alexis from a tavern in London, where he is in company with one G. Bagnall, has a postscript wherein the said Bagnall refers to Alexis as "Mr. Moor"—"Mr. Moor, having, I suppose, told you what news there is. . . ." It was of course an easy matter for an editor of Pope, reading all the Mapledurham papers in his function as Pope scholar, to link this "Mr. Moor" with the Moore on whom

ferred to above was marked by some early reader "Alex. Pope to Martha Blount," an ascription corrected, it is believed by Carruthers, to "James Moore Smythe, not Pope." Carruthers takes it for granted that Alexander and Alexis were one, and even cites this letter as an instance of Alexis' (or Moore Smythe's) epistolary style. He declares, "The loose, sprawling handwriting and ineffable nonsense of the letter proclaim its author." This in spite of the fact that the letter, which is assuredly "loose and sprawling" is in an entirely different hand from that of Alexis, which there is no reason to call either loose or sprawling. Who Alexander was it is at present impossible to say.

[4] *Papers of a Critic*, 1875, I, 154 ff.

Pope had later bestowed some slight measure of uncomfortable immortality. At any rate, this seems to be the source of the error.

The letters themselves also reveal the true author, Alexis, or "Mr. Moor," as G. Bagnall calls him, as one of the Moores of Fawley Court in Berkshire, about twenty miles west of Mapledurham. Allusions in the letters make this perfectly apparent—"since I came to Fawley," "my sister Moor" "our butler from Fawley is come to town," "I will take Mapledurham on my way home," etc. Moreover there is in the correspondence a letter dated October 13th, and written from somewhere in the country, in which romantic "Zephylinda" and "Alexis" are dropped for plain "Teresa Blount" and "H. Moore." This letter, which is in the Alexis hand, promises more frivolous intelligence when next the writer goes up to town, and alludes to several recognizable pieces of choice gossip already reported.

The Blounts and the Moores of Fawley were very old Catholic families and were allied by two marriages in the middle of the seventeenth century, one in a collateral line, and one between a daughter of Sir Henry Moore (created baronet in 1627) and Sir Richard Blount of Mapledurham. The H. Moore of Alexis fame was doubtless Henry, a twin brother of the contemporary baronet, Sir Richard Moore.[5]

The relationship between Alexis and Zephylinda may then be easily imagined. They were members of two of those old Catholic families which formed one of the most exclusive and aristocratic groups in England. The social relations of a Catholic family were practically altogether with other Catholic families, a fact which, in view of the small number of Catholic gentry, must have led to a comparatively narrow circle of friends and a correspondingly high degree of intimacy. Thus the Blounts had nothing to do with their Protestant neighbors, but found their friends altogether among Catholics. The tone of the Alexis letters indicates a close family acquaintance. Their author refers continually in intimate terms to other members of the family, implies that Martha will see what he is writing to Teresa, and speaks once of Teresa's having laid it on him as a duty to write every post. The letters are certainly not love-letters. The high-flown, extravagant love-making

[5] See Wotton, *English Baronetage*, and B. M. Add. Mss. 19142, p. 222.

in them is, rather, merely an attempted exercise of wit; Alexis is trying to give life and vivacity to his compositions. One may answer Dilke's query by saying that not only were Teresa and Moore-Smythe in all probability unacquainted, but also that, as far as one can judge from his letters, there was no relation beyond close family friendship between her and the real Alexis, Henry Moore.

After all then, these letters, beyond one or two passing allusions, have no direct bearing on Pope; they are interesting Popeiana only in that they illustrate the lives of his friends the Blount sisters.[6]

University of Minnesota. JAMES T. HILLHOUSE.

NOTES ON OLD ENGLISH POETRY

(1). *Exeter Gnomic Verses,* 150 ff.

Gryre sceal for grēggum, græf dēadum men;
hungre hēofeð, nales þæt hēafe bewindeð,
ne hūru wæl wēpeð wulf sē grǣga.

In *Beowulf,* both in the description of the hero's funeral (ll. 3134 ff.) and in other passages referring to funeral ceremony (ll. 1108 ff., 2124 ff.), the dead body is burnt upon a pyre. Yet, as Chadwick has pointed out (*The Heroic Age,* pp. 44 f.), the practice of cremation seems to have passed out of use among the Anglo-Saxons about the middle of the sixth century, at least a generation before the arrival of the Christian missionaries. Since *Beowulf* in its present form cannot be older than the end of the seventh century, its references to cremation must be due to tradition (cf. Chambers, *Beowulf, An Introduction,* p. 125), and the final funeral-song, delivered by a band of horsemen who ride round the memorial mound (ll. 3169 ff.), must be part of the tradition. Probably, however, this funeral-song was little affected by the change from cremation to burial, and when the dead man was a king or lord it may still have been delivered by a band of chosen

[6] The writer is indebted to Mrs. E. F. Riddell-Blount of Mapledurham for permission to examine this correspondence, and also for much interesting information concerning the letters and the general history of the Blount family. The present orderly state of the Mapledurham papers is due to her care and interest.

thanes who rode round the grave. These three lines from the *Exeter Gnomic Verses* are perhaps some evidence of this. "There shall be terror on account of the grey (wolf), and a grave for the dead man. It cries out from hunger, and does not encircle that (grave) with lamentation; and certainly the grey wolf does not weep for the murder." The howl of the wolf, the poet may mean, is a cry of hunger, not of grief, and very unlike the lamentation of those who ride round the dead man's grave.

(2). *The Ruin,* 27 f.

> Wurdon hyra wīgsteal wēstenstaþolas,
> brosnade burgsteall.

The poet is describing the destruction of the city. *Wīgsteal* has always been taken to be the compound of *wīg,* "war," and *steall,* "position," that occurs twice elsewhere in O. E. poetry (*Solomon and Saturn,* 103, *Mind of Men,* 39) and renders *propugnaculum* in glosses. But there is another word *wīgsteall,* of which the first part is not *wīg,* "war," but *wīg, wīh, wēoh,* "idol," "fane." It is found as a gloss of *absida,* and is translated in Bosworth-Toller "the part of the church where the altar stands." It may quite well be this second word which is used here, and in its literal sense of "place of idols," "temple." The line would then mean "Their temples" (not, "their bulwarks") "became waste places," and would probably be a reminiscence of one or two passages in the Old Testament, e. g., *Amos* VII, 9, *Et demolientur excelsa idoli, et sanctificationes Israel desolabuntur,* or *Micah* I, 7. If, as is pretty certain, the ruined city is Roman Aquae Sulis, modern Bath, we know that in the midst of the Roman baths there stood a temple originally sacred to Sul Minerva.

(3). *The Text of "The Wanderer."*

6. *Swā cwæð eardstapa.* "So said the Wanderer." The past tense *cwæð* must refer to what precedes, and lines 1 to 5 should be placed within inverted commas, as the beginning of the Wanderer's soliloquy. Contrast *ācwið,* present tense, referring to what follows, in line 91.

29. The MS. (Exeter Book) reading would appear to be *weman* rather than *wenian.* *Wēman,* "to entice," "to attract," suits the context quite well.

85. The MS. has quite clearly *yþde*. Thorpe, Wülker, and all subsequent editors have given *yþðe* as the MS. reading, and emended to *yþde*.

(4). *The Rhymed Poem*, 1 f.

Mē lifes onlāh sē þis lēoht onwrāh
ond þæt torhte geteoh tillice onwrāh.

The failure of good rhyme in line 2 is very suspicious, and Grein emended *geteoh* to *getāh*, which he translated by "disciplinam." In an article in the *Journal of Germanic Philology*, XXI, 510, I suggested that *getāh* might be the past tense of *getēon*, "to grant" (instead of *getēah*). I now think it more probable that in the original (Anglian) manuscript the two lines ran as follows,

Me lifes onleh se þis leht onwreh
ond þæt torhte geteh tillice onwreh.

with the rhymes *onlēh, onwrēh, getēh, onwrēh,* these forms arising by smoothing from *onlēah, onwrēah,* and *getēah*. *Lēon* and *wrēon* are verbs belonging to the 1st Ablaut series, but the former ocasionally, and the latter more often than not, form their past tenses on the analogy of the verbs of the 2nd Ablaut series. The scribe who made the rather inefficient translation of the poem into West Saxon, however, turned *onlēh* and *onwrēh* into the regular forms *onlāh* and *onwrāh*, but (since there is no form **getāh*) took *geteh* (W. S. *geteoh*) to be the noun meaning "implement," and to be the object of the second *onwrāh*.

I would therefore suggest the following text and translation,

Mē lifes onlēah sē þis lēoht onwrēah,
ond þæt torhte getēah, tillice onwrēah,

"He granted me life, who revealed this sun, and gave the bright (sun), graciously revealed (it)." No student of *The Rhymed Poem* will be surprised at the feeble tautology.,

W. S. MACKIE.

University of Cape Town.

O. F. *ERCIER, ERSER.*

The O. F. word *ercier* (*erser*) has never been attested, as far as I have been able to determine, in O. F. published texts nor has it been listed in dictionaries of Old French. It seems to me to be a curious fact, therefore, that I have chanced upon it in three passages. I have noted it twice (cf. *a* and *b* below) in a thirteenth century manuscript of Old French *fabliaux*[1] now in the possession of Lord and Lady Middleton of Wollaton Hall, Nottinghamshire, England, to whom my thanks are due for permitting me to obtain a rotograph copy of their manuscript. The author of these *fabliaux,* a certain *jongleur* Gautier le Leu, was a native of Haute Picardie and flourished probably during the first half of the 13th century. His language is picturesquely popular and it is evident from the subject matter of his *fabliaux* that his audiences were not refined ones. Certain very unusual and unique words found in the text of the *fabliaux,* among them *ercier,* must have been intelligible in Gautier's day to the public that frequented the taverns and public squares where he recited his poems.

(a)

Puis a les .11. traus mesurés,
Il ne fu mie bellurés
Qu'il n'ait contremont *erciet*[2]
Qu'il a au plus lonc aderciet.

(Ms. *De l'Aventure d'Ardanne*)

(b)

Tant s'est de totes pars *erciés*
Qu'il est a son lit aderciés

(Ms. *De Deus Vilains*)

The third occurrence of the word in the form *erser* is found in the text of a prose tale by Philippe de Vigneulles which was written in Metz between the years 1505 and 1515:[3]

[1] See *Historical Manuscripts Commission. Report of the Manuscripts of Lord Middleton preserved at Wollaton Hall, Nottinghamshire* (Hereford, 1911), pp. 233 f.

[2] This verse and the one following are lacking in the published version of the *fabliau*, cf. Montaiglon et Reynaud, *Recueil Général des Fabliaux,* Paris, 1880, I, p. 232 (*Del Sot Chevalier*).

[3] The manuscript is in the possession of the author of this article, cf. *Revue du XIVe siècle,* x (1923), 159-203.

(a)

Car le ventre et la vecye luy commençoit a doloir tant avoit grant besoing de pisser et ne se osoit bouger. Et tellement que pour la grant fain qu'il avoit de pisser et de laicher son eaue le membre viril commença ung peu a *erser* et a dresser et luy ennuyoit de tant estre a table.

(Ms. *Contes* de Philippe de Vigneulles)

In the first two passages from the *fabliaux* of Gautier le Leu *ercier* rhymes with *adercier,* a Picard form of the verb *adrecier.* In the third case *erser* is used along with *dresser.* It is strongly probable that the etymon is Latin *ērectus* (*ērigĕre*) plus a verbal suffix *-iare* which was much used in V. L. to form verbs from participles and adjectives. Other forms of similar derivation are **captiare>chasser; directiare>dresser; pertusiare>percer; punctiare > poincier,* etc. and hypothetical forms: **corruptiare > couressier; *strictiare* > O. F. *estrecier; *tractiare > tracer,* etc. Therefor V. L. **ērectiare > *erecier > ercier, erser.* An influence of *adercier, dercier,* (*adresser, dresser*) might have contributed toward the omission of the *e* of the second syllable in parts of the verb where the *e* was unaccented, and the prevailing of these forms.[4]

The finding of this word in two authors between whom several centuries elapsed would tend to show that it was persistent even if dialectal. To judge by the evidence of all of the passages, it was continually associated with *adresser* and *dresser,* the possible influence of which on the form has been noted.

The etymon suggested might account also for the meaning of the word. In passage *b* it is used reflexively in the sense of *se diriger* (one of the rare meanings of O. F. *drecier*), but in the other two passages it is intransitive with the meaning of rise, go up. The only other traces of *ērigĕre, ērectus* in French are to be found in modern French *alerte,* (borrowed from Italian) and in O. F. *aerdre* if it derives from **aderigere,* which seems to be more than doubtful.[5]

CHARLES H. LIVINGSTON.

Bowdoin College.

[4] Cf. the forms of O. F. *corecier, corecer,* etc. with shortened forms *courcier, courser,* etc. both series apparently in frequent use. Both forms are used by Froissart (II, 29, 102, 169; V, 208).

[5] Cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Rom. Etym. Wört.,* no. 162.

SHAKESPEARE'S *MEACOCKE*

> **'Tis a world to see**
> **How tame when men and women are alone,**
> **A meacocke wretch can make the curstest shrew.**
> ***Taming of the Shrew*, II, 1, 307 seq.**

Editors of the *Shrew* define *meacocke* as 'timorous, spiritless, effeminate, henpecked.' Dictionaries add to this list: 'silly,[1] uxorius,[2] cowardly.'[3] Quotations from English Literature listed by Halliwell,[4] Wright,[5] Nares,[6] Farmer and Henley,[7] and the *New English Dictionary* justify these definitions, for the word is used substantively as synonymous with *fool, milksop, dastard, coward.*

Although writers agree upon its meaning, only a few attempt a conjecture as to its etymology. Bailey[8] suggests "*mew cock,* one who mews himself up out of harm's way in any danger." Pope, also, gives "*mew cock,* or one who has been shut up." Johnson quotes Skinner "*mes coq*" which Nares ridicules, and declares "The plain English compound meek-cock, is a much more probable account of it; being frequently, and perhaps originally applied to a hen-pecked husband, a cock that yielded to the hen."[9] This explanation is still accepted by some writers,[10] though the *NED* considers it "untenable," explaining that the word is "of obscure

[1] Halliwell, *Dictionary of Archaic and Provincial Words.*

[2] Coles, *English-Latin, Latin-English Dictionary.*

[3] Nares, *Glossary.*

[4] Halliwell, *Op. cit.*

[5] Wright, *Provincial Dictionary.*

[6] Nares, *Op. cit.*

[7] *Slang and its Analogues.*

[8] *Etymological English Dictionary.*

[9] The possible explanation of *meacock* as 'meek cock' might be found in the characterization of the capon as meek. Batman, *Uppon Bartholome* (p. 582, Liber Duodecimus, cap. 17), says of the capon, he "loseth his boldness, and his voice . . . he sitteth on broode uppon egges that be not his own as it were an henne, and taketh uppon him the office of a female, . . . and the capon is more coward of heart than the cocke." If, however, capon and meacock were synonymous, Shakespeare would probably have used the latter in "Mome, malt-horse, capon, coxcomb, idiot, patch!" (*Comedy of Errors,* III, 1-32.

[10] Cf. *Taming of the Shrew,* Arden Ed.

origin: perhaps originally a name of some bird." Two quotations make this seem probable:

> "For my part I shall no more be such a meacock
> To deal with the plumes of a Hyde-Park Peacock." [11]
> "As fine a fi'pence, as proud as a peacock,
> As stout as a stockfish, as meek as a meacock." [12]

The latter comparison of meacock with stockfish, would suggest that, if it is a bird, it is probably an aquatic, or shore bird. The first instance of the use of the word in English Literature cited by the *NED* is: "He sholde be no cowarde, no maycocke, no fearfull persone that dare nothynge enterpryse." [13] In this quotation, as will be observed, the spelling is *maycocke,* though subsequently, it varies between *meacock* and *mecock,* with addition of a final *e.*

There may be a connection between this word and *maycock,* the provincial name for the grey plover (*Squatarola Helvetica*),[14] a bird whose shy and wary habits may have provoked the epithets *timorous, weak,* and *cowardly.* These birds travel singly or in flocks of ten or twelve, and so secretive are they, that ornithologists searched vainly many years for their breeding places and nests. Romance, superstition,[15] and legend [16] became attached to the bird. The first eggs were taken by Von Middendorf in 1843.

[11] D'Urfey, *Pills,* 1872, IV, 14.

[12] *Appius and Virginia,* Dodsley, *Old Plays,* IV, 118.

[13] Wynkyn de Worde, *Pylgrimage of Perfection,* 1526 (Quoted from *NED*).

[14] H. K. Swann, *A Dictionary of English and Folknames of British Birds,* London: Witherby and Co., 1913.

[15] Marguerite D'Angoulême expresses one of these superstitions in *L'Heptaméron,* novelle Trente-Deuxiesme: "'Vous vivez donc de foi et d'esperance.' dit Nomerside, Comme le pluvier du vent, vous êtes bien aisé à nourrir." Paris: Alphonse Lemerre, Éditeur, 1879, p. 179.

[16] The Rumanian story: *Why do the Plover Fly Singly?* is an example of the legends. It is as follows: "In the beginning, the plover used to fly in large coveys. But one day, when Our Lady was riding on a horse, they ran across the road and frightened the horse so much that it threw the rider. Angry at the mishap, St. Mary cursed the plover that they should no longer gather in coveys but should go singly. And so it has remained to this very day. The plover nest quite alone and never join others in their flight." *Rumanian Bird and Beast Stories* in *Folk Lore,* Vol. LXXV, p. 183. London: Sedgwick and Jackson, 1915.

In 1875, Seebohm and Harvie-Brown found eleven nests on the tundras of Petchora 68° N. latitude.[17] Subsequent study revealed the fact that the gray plover breeds in Arctic Europe and Asia beyond the limit of forest growth. Although a few young birds stop in England on their way south, the most of them winter in Africa and the Mediterranean Basin. Late in May, they pass along the coast of England on the way to their breeding place.[18] Perhaps, for this reason, they are called maycocks. Little is yet known of the breeding habits of the bird, except that the mate shares in the incubation.[19]

It does not seem unlikely that the wariness and shyness observed in the plover, coupled with the mystery surrounding its habits, led to the application of *meek,* and *fearful.* These, gathering strength through repetition, became *weakling, dastard, coward,* and gave rise to such uses as: "For you are meacocks, fools, and miserable";[20] "A meacock is he who dreadth to see blood shed";[21] and "The meacock verse that dares not sing."[21]

Johns Hopkins University. MARIE L. C. LINTHICUM.

REVIEWS

Las Bacantes o del origen del teatro. By ADOLFO BONILLA Y SAN MARTÍN. Madrid, 1921. 168 pp.

In the first of the four chapters which form this book Professor Bonilla questions the traditional view of a common "Dionysiac" origin of Greek tragedy and comedy. If the primitive form of the Greek dithyramb is reducible to "el canto aislado de un poeta" (p. 22), referring to the actions and history of the god, and there-

[17] Charles Stonham, *The Birds of the British Islands.* London: Grant Richards, 1916, Vol. IV, p. 610. Or see Mr. Seebohm's own account in his *British Birds,* Vol. III, p. 38.

[18] *The British Bird Book,* ed. by F. B. Kirkman. London: T. C. and E. C. Jack, 1910, Vol. VIII, p. 357.

[19] Males were shot from eggs by Seebohm (*Op. cit.,* III, p. 38), and by Slater (*British Birds with Their Nests and Eggs,* Vol. V, p. 77).

[20] Beaumont, *Wit Without Money,* II, 11-40.

[21] Quoted from Farmer and Henley, *Op. cit.*

fore of a narrative nature, then an epic origin may be claimed for tragedy. Using Nietzsche's terminology, "la tragedia, en su forma clásica, es lo *Apolíneo,* y la comedia, lo propiamente *Dionisiaco*" (p. 23); in tragedy man is made to realize his bondage, in comedy he finds his liberation. Of course, the validity of this thesis, as applied to the origins, will have to be tested by students of Greek literature.

The interest of the Hispanist centers on the following chapters, which take up all but thirty-five pages of the book. The author disclaims any attempt at a thorough study of the evolution of the Spanish stage before Lope de Vega, but purposes: "de trazar los remotos orígenes de nuestra escena . . . y de clasificar las más importantes corrientes dramáticas anteriores a la dominación literaria del 'Fénix de los ingenios.'" This part is not without connection with the opening chapters, since the fundamental distinction enunciated there forms the esthetic background of the author's classification. The various currents distinguished for the sake of clearer analysis are credited in turn with certain "Apollonic" and "Dionysiac" qualities, which eventually mingled in fortunate proportions, created the Spanish *comedia.*

The material available on the transitional period after the end of Roman civilization, collected from inscriptions, the Church Fathers, canons and councils and secular laws, is here conveniently arranged, showing that throughout the darkest ages a dramatic tradition of some sort maintained itself. It might be observed that both Glóck and Allen have seriously questioned Reich's representation of the *mime* as the savior of tradition.[1]

The Valera-Cañete controversy on the liturgical origin of the modern Spanish drama, although dormant, is really not closed. The evident historic connection between Church and drama, as the author points out (p. 75), does not imply a causal relation between them. Yet it seems that so far not enough evidence of secular influence at the time of the earliest preserved dramas has been collected to reopen the question.

[1] A. Glóck, *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Litgesch.* XVI (1905), 25-45, 172-191. P. S. Allen, *Mod. Phil.,* VII (1909-10), 329 ff., VIII, 1 ff. R. Herzog's attack on Reich (*Berliner philol. Wochenschrift,* 1904, nr. 34) has been countered by Winterfeld, *Deutsche Dichter des Mittelalters,* München, 1917, *Anhang,* II, 470-528.

The reader of Isidore's *Etymologies,* of Papias's *Elementarium,* or the great *Catholicon* of Johannes Januensis [2] will be easily convinced that the secret of the Classical drama was completely lost. It is very doubtful whether Isidore, for one, given a comedy of Terence, could have even remotely realized its possibilities for esthetic enjoyment. What might be questioned, therefore, pending the discovery of further material on the origins, is not so much the point of fact as the specific importance of the medieval origins for the development of the modern drama. If left to themselves, what would the early liturgical plays have produced? The answer lies in the dull and formless religious plays of the sixteenth century, when untouched by Classical influence. Is it not true that without the liturgical drama the meaning of the Terence and Plautus manuscripts, of the dramaturgic passages in the Roman grammarians, of Aristotle's *Poetics* would have been eventually discovered, and would have informed and disciplined the human instinct of mimicry, creating an instrument of delight centuries advanced beyond the liturgical stage? In fact, with the liturgical drama in full efflorescence, the modern world was pathetically slow in grasping the lesson of Classical dramaturgy, failed indeed for a time to recognize any relationship between the two. Encina's *Plácida y Vitoriano,* perhaps, but surely Torres Naharro's *Himenea,* the first real Spanish drama, could not have existed but for the rediscovery in Italy of the Greek "invention" of the drama.

Professor Bonilla includes in his survey a number of hybrids such as the Catalan *Mascarón,* recited, according to Milá, by one single performer, and representations, some entirely inanimate, some in the nature of *tableaux vivants,* with written and sometimes spoken explanations, often with music and even elaborate mechanical scenery. This should open promising fields of research on the outskirts of the drama. The so-called *comedia alegórica* of 1414 is rightly (*cf.* Crawford, *Rev. hisp.,* xxiv, 9) put down as an elaborate *momo,* although the spoken *coplas* should no longer be credited to Villena. (Bonilla, p. 82). It might be added that

[2] *Cf.* E. H. Hall, *Papias and his contemporaries,* Boston, 1899. E. Brehaut, *An encyclopedist of the Dark Ages, Isidore of Seville,* New York, 1912.

the five so-called *autos* performed in Valladolid in 1527 were no doubt productions of the same nature, as a comparison of Sandoval's description with the report of similar entertainments at Saragossa in 1399 will show.[3] Interesting additions are made to what we know about the use of the word *entremés* from Milá, Rouanet, Restori, Cotarelo, and Bonilla's own edition of the *entremeses* of Cervantes. Lamarca's interpretation of *entramesos* as mimic representations or *rocas* mostly on wheels, is confirmed by Pedroso and Milá.[4] In the *entremeses* which Milá describes, such as the representation of the battle of Saint Michael with the host of Lucifer, lies the connection of the drama with the allegorical tournament, a field still untouched for the history of romantic subject-matter in Spain. It seems doubtful whether Cristóbal de Villalón uses the word *entremés* in the dramatic sense. About 1550 the term was still currently used (by Palau, for example) with the meaning of jest, and continued to be used as such even after the dramatic *entremés* had unquestionably taken shape. With Cueva, however,[5] the word seems to have definitely acquired the meaning of *lance representable.* With Timoneda (*Turiana,* 1565) it seems to have lost the connotation of "something in-between," and encroaches actually on the prologue (*Passo de dos clérigos*). The definition (p. 87, n. 1) of the *mimo,* and its identification with the *entremés* by Padre José Alcazar, were, of course, borrowed by the latter from Caramuel.

The final chapter of the book is the longest and perhaps the most important. Bibliographical indications here are purposely scanty, as the author promises an amplification of this part. First consideration is given to the *Celestina* and its school. That the "sense of tragedy" of the *Celestina,* had it not been smothered under the bucolic tendencies of Encina and Italian importataions, might have then and there caused a blossoming of noteworthy drama, seems true enough, and is confirmed by the fact that the *Himenea* has caught more of the bitter-sweet flavor of that amazing book than any other product of the sixteenth century.

The *estilo pastoril* is next distinguished, represented by Encina,

[3] Sandoval, *Hist. del emperador Carlos V*, Amberes, 1681, I, 619; Milá, *Orígenes*, 236 ff.

[4] *B. AA. EE.*, LVIII, XV; Milá, 248.

[5] *Cf.* Licio in the *Comedia del Tutor* (1579), ed. Icaza, I, 367.

Fernández, Gil Vicente, and Diego Sánchez de Badajoz. In discussing Encina's claim to the title of founder of this school it should not be forgotten that the little nativity-play in Íñigo de Mendoza's *Vita Christi,* although meant to be read, is already a perfect model of its kind, using the so-called *sayagués,* and with the shepherd type so well developed that it is difficult to consider even this as a first attempt. Certain important themes, which run through many productions of the *estilo pastoril,* such as the consistent defeat of the rustic competing with the courtier for the favor of a lady, are obviously derived from a tradition of lyrical poetry, also much older than Encina. The distinction between Encina and Fernández is perhaps too severe against Fernández, and it may be questioned whether "la insufrible brutalidad que muestran muchas de las farsas pastoriles de la primera mitad del siglo XVI, más que con el teatro de Encina, se entronca con el de Lucas Fernández" (p. 111). The reference (p. 113) to possible French influence, as yet undetermined, in Gil Vicente[6] again opens a promising vista. The pointer about the Spanish *pulla* is also worth following up.

It is curious to notice what conflicting opinions have been expressed about some little-read sixteenth-century plays. Thus, the *Égloga* (later *Farsa*) of Juan de Paris, probably written about 1520 (Kohler) and first printed in 1536, is here called "linda" and "uno de los ejemplares más perfectos en su género" (p. 118). Ticknor considered it a remarkable mixture, but I confess to a very poor opinion of it from any point of view. The *Comedia Fenisa,* which Moratín, I believe, considered worthless, was undoubtedly very popular,[7] and Professor Bonilla has reprinted it, in my opinion deservedly. But it will be asked why this playlet was not included in the *estilo pastoril,* which the author describes as having simple technique, few characters, little intrigue, and at bottom "es casi siempre una cuestión de amor" (p. 123). The *Fenisa* is the earliest instance of a *caso de amor* on the Spanish stage, yet it is classified in the *estilo artificioso* (p. 128). Among the chief characteristics of the *estilo artificioso,* represented by Torres Na-

[6] *Cf.* the *Auto dos quatro tempos* and the end of the *Auto da Fe.*

[7] Eslava, in his third *Coloquio* (México, 1574) clearly alludes to the *Fenisa,* done "a lo divino."

harro and Palau's *Salamantina,* the *urban* character of the plays, giving realistic descriptions of town life, might well be included. The *Tragedia de los amores de Eneas y de la Reyna Dido* (p. 127) is out of place here.

The essential originality of Torres Naharro's *introito* is well brought out (125 ff.). If he did not invent it, its origin does not lie in Alione de Asti's *introitus,* nor in Italy altogether, but more probably in certain forms of the French drama. The discussion of the *bando toscano,* or current of Italian influence, includes an interesting collection of references to the popularity of Alberto Ganassa. It might be added that Ganassa is also coupled with his "side-partner," Trastulo (whose name passed into the Spanish vocabulary [*Quixote,* II, 7]), in the *Coplas de Trescientas cosas más,* and was mentioned again in a later *Loa de Disparates,* and still somewhat later credited with a popular joke by Juan de Luna.[8] The source of the *Comedia de Sepúlveda* (pp. 132 ff.), pointed out by Crawford (*Romanic Review,* XI [1920], 76 ff.), might have been given. The note on p. 134 suggests that the development of the terms *paso* and *entremés* will bear further investigation. This also applies to the word *sainete,* which would appear to have a dramatic implication perhaps as early as the burlesque *Libro de Cetrería* of Evangelista.[9] It is questionable that Palau used the word *entremés* with the meaning of "lance cómico representable."[10] The "necio e impertinente prurito de enristrar palabrotas sin sentido . . ." (p. 136) in the plays of Alonso de la Vega is justly censured, yet must be considered as a legitimate attempt at comic appeal based on a children's game.[11] The reference in the *Pelegrino curioso* (p. 137, n. 2) should be credited to Fray Tomás Quixada, the embittered author of the *Consulta* prefixed to that work. Perhaps too much space is given to the *Entremés de un viejo ques*

[8] *Coplas* (middle of sixteenth century), *Rev. hisp.*, IX (1902), 265; *Loa, ibid.*, XXXVII (1916), 402; Luna, *Diálogos familiares*, Paris, 1621 (first ed., 1619), p. 106. The joke still persists in modified form in Andalusia. *Cf.* Fernán Caballero, *Obras*, XVI, 276.

[9] Probably fifteenth century, ed. Paz y Melia, *Zeitschr. f. rom. Phil.*, I, 222 ff.

[10] Compare the instances of *Salamantina*, 1236, 2282; *Custodia del Hombre*, 2432; *Victoria de Christo*, ap. Rouanet, *Colección*, IV, 386, etc.

[11] *Cf.* Rodríguez Marín, *Cantos populares*, I, 85 ff.

casado con una muger moça. Professor Northup[12] has recently pointed out its parallel in an Italian *scenario.*

In the section on the *drama sagrado* (p. 141) attention is drawn for the first time to the source of Joseph's lament before the tomb of his mother, in Carvajal's *Josefina.* Concerning the digression on the *Loa* (p. 142, n. 2) it might be remarked that the term is already used by Diego Sánchez de Badajoz (*Farsa de la Muerte*). On the merits of Carvajal-Hurtado's *Cortes de la Muerte* I confess to disagreement with the author (p. 143); the indictment of the *conquistadores* by the Indians has a sombre power, shared in a measure by the scenes of the poor and the peasants. The *rufián* scene is graphic, that of the *ladrones* dramatic, the *pastor* is amusing, and the judge and the nun are interesting, and altogether it seems unjust to charge this play, in the sixteenth century, with "escasos bríos." In the "imitación clásica" the early translations in *lemosín* are not noticed. The *Tragedia* on Agamemnon by Anrrique Ayres Victoria appears to be an outright translation from Pérez de Oliva.[13]

The sixth (not including the *Celestina*) and last type described by the author is *el estilo trágica.* This is perhaps the most interesting part of the sixteenth-century drama, not in itself (it is very dull), but as a key to the birth of the *Comedia,* and deserves a study by itself.[14] It brings the author back to the principles outlined at the start; but before finally restating these with the added weight of gathered evidence, he surveys the relationship of the sixteenth-century stage with lyrical poetry. This leads away from the main theme, but into some stimulating considerations on the early lyric. The relations of the drama with singing and music, in and out of the Church, no doubt need further investigation.

There are a few misprints (pp. 124, 127, 134, etc.), but also some interesting illustrations, especially (on p. 103) the portrait of "Alonso de Villegas," possibly the author of the *Comedia Selvagia.*

Here we have at last, for a period long blighted by the shadow

[12] *Ten Spanish Farces,* Boston [1922], p. xiii.

[13] *Cf.* the edition by Francisco Esteves Pereira, Lisboa, 1918, p. 13.

[14] The *Filis* of Lupercio Leonardo de Argensola (p. 149) is mistakenly connected with Dolce, where *La Alejandra* was meant.

of Cañete, not merely a chronicle-history, but an interpretation. The author himself presents his book as a preparatory sketch, and thus forestalls the possible reproach of deficient bibliography, occasional discursiveness, and a certain lack of perspective and unity. Its appeal, of course, is partly dependent upon the favor which its main thesis may, or may not, find; but divorced from the thesis, and considered as a first sketch of the Spanish drama before Lope, it is still a keen and brilliant piece of work, boldly planned, richly documented, and unusually stimulating.

JOSEPH E. GILLET.

Bryn Mawr College.

The Influence of Milton on English Poetry. By RAYMOND DEXTER HAVENS. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1922.

No review can do more than suggest the wealth of detailed information which is to be found in Professor Havens' book, and which makes it henceforth one of the indispensable resources of the student of the eighteenth century. The elaborate bibliographies of eighteenth century verse at the end of the volume, valuable references in profusion in the foot-notes, long accumulations of parallels from greater and lesser poets, suggestive comments on many aspects of the poetic theory and practice of the eighteenth century, a thorough history of the sonnet—these are some of the results of years of thorough and careful study, made available to other scholars in this imposing and, let us add, beautifully printed volume.

Precisely because the work has so many of the qualities of a standard treatise and will inevitably be consulted not only by mature scholars, but by graduate students and others with varying degrees of preparation, is it necessary to question the results of this study, whether as a contribution to the interpretation of Milton or of the eighteenth century. For the book is rather depressing to the lover of English poetry. As one reads through these hundreds of carefully documented pages on the influence of Milton, the conclusion grows stronger and stronger that this influence has been on the whole unfortunate and even pernicious;

the hero of the book becomes, through no fault of his own, the villain. There are of course many passages which contradict this general impression. Professor Havens remarks, for instance, that "English poetry from Pope to Keats shows a steadily-increasing attention to the connotative, the imaginative and poetic, value of words, a change that is due largely to the influence of Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton" (p. 66). But in spite of such statements, the general impression remains, and Professor Havens seems to share it. "Miltonic" becomes synonymous with all that is bad in eighteenth-century verse, and the eighteenth century with vicious diction down to the "reeking tube and iron shard" of Kipling's *Recessional* (p. 68, n.). The *Gentleman's Magazine* in 1789 described a poem as "in blank verse, high-sounding language, without clear ideas." "Can there be any doubt," asks Professor Havens, "that it is Miltonic?" (p. 253). A few pages further on we read: "From these two poems it would seem that Hurdis had largely emancipated himself from the inflated style and language that are so ill adapted to rural descriptions. In reality he had done nothing of the kind, for in his remaining works he becomes increasingly Miltonic" (p. 261). In another place: "Many of the early translators would have been more successful if they had never read Milton" (p. 356). The style of Robert Pollok, he says, "though similar to Cowper's, is much more Miltonic. It is, indeed, strangely so for a work that appeared the same year as Tennyson's first volume; but here again it belongs with the eighteenth century" (p. 411). It is true that Professor Havens has, in the proper place, already laid the blame for this "Miltonic" diction on Thomson, and completely exonerated Milton (p. 144). But it is not at all clear that the writers of "Miltonic" diction were imitating Thomson rather than Milton, nor does Professor Havens indicate that he believes any such distinction was in their minds. All this bad verse is quoted and discussed in connection with the influence of *Milton* on English poetry.

Of course the truth regarding Milton's influence is what we want, whether pleasant or not. Professor Havens has worked with scientific precision and thoroughness to get at the truth. The difficulty with his method is really, however, that he has aimed at a greater precision than his subject would admit of, and thus

missed an essential part of it. He has traced the influence of Milton by means of certain rather obvious characteristics of style and diction. But in proportion as the imitator is great or genuinely poetical, do the limitations of this scientific technique become apparent. As Professor Havens himself says in regard to Wordsworth: "the familiar evidences of the influence of *Paradise Lost*—adjectives employed as adverbs or substantives, unusual compound epithets, parentheses, appositives, omitted words, and the rest—indicate very inadequately the extent of that influence on the poetry of Wordsworth" (p. 177). The reviewer feels that this passage suggests a kind of poetical influence which might well be sought for also in Cowper, Gray, Thomson and even in the despised lesser eighteenth century imitators, who might conceivably have been even worse poets had they not been touched, even slightly, by the divine fire of Milton. The reviewer likes to think that there is considerable Miltonic influence to be detected in Dryden's *Absalom and Achitophel.* Certainly Dryden longed to write an epic poem. He thought *Annus Mirabilis* had epic characteristics. Likewise he cast his great satire in the form of an epic fragment, the whole forming a sort of parallel to the temptation *motif* in *Paradise Lost.* Speeches are concluded with the epic formula "He said," and here and there are lines with some of the resonance of Milton's large utterance. It does not seem extravagant, therefore, to conclude that Dryden's poem owes something of its dignity and elevation to Milton's epic. At any rate this is a *kind* of poetical influence which must be considered, even though no scientifically accurate method has been devised for dealing with it. And only in so far as this kind of poetical influence is measured, will we know how greatly Milton has stimulated the poetic life and genuine poetic production in writers since his time.

Certainly too much has been said proportionately regarding the diction of eighteenth-century poetry. Although since Wordsworth that period has been heavily blamed for its abuse of diction, the classical writers do not seem to have believed that poetic diction is the most poetical part of poetry. Among the critics of the Augustan age it was a commonplace that the design of the poem, its unity and total effect, is a beauty of a higher order than the delight in diction. The whole subject is one which needs further investigation, in the light of which Milton's influence on eighteenth-

century poetry will have to be re-examined, with results possibly less damaging both to Milton and to the eighteenth century than those arrived at by Professor Havens.

It should be the aim of every investigator to do his work so well that it need never be done again, and Professor Havens has worked with admirable thoroughness. But even thoroughness has its dangers, though one is seldom obliged to dwell on them. A considerable part of the output of the printing presses, whether in the eighteenth or the twentieth century, must be of little or no importance either as literature or as documents in literary history. Before we assume the importance of a poem in literary history, we must know something of its vogue, of its reception in its own day. If it was still-born, it probably has no place in history. If the eighteenth century rejected it as insignificant, literary history should in fairness to that period do likewise. It is not contended, of course, that the historian of literature should not have an insatiable and prying curiosity, nor that bibliographies should not aim at completeness. The historian uses scientific method in gathering and classifying his material, but his final product must be artistic and selective.

It would be unfair to this monumental volume to claim that it is the standard and final treatment of Milton's influence on English poetry. But students of the eighteenth century, who, as Professor Havens says, labor "in a field where assumptions and unsupported assertions have been rife and scholarship is still young," will be under deep obligations to the immense accumulation of materials, which the author himself has called the "dry bones of literary history."

University of Michigan. LOUIS I. BREDVOLD.

Modern Swedish Grammar. By IM. BJÖRKHAGEN. Stockholm, P. A. Norstedt & Söner, 1923. Pp. 204.

There has been evidenced in recent years an increasing interest both in England and Germany in the study of the Norwegian and Swedish languages. Thus there was established some years ago in Berlin University a chair in Swedish; and lectureships in both Swedish and Norwegian were established in the University

of London (University College). Swedish scholars in particular have been prompt to try to supply the needed text-books in this work, in the effort to place it on a par with other modern language instruction so far as actual class-room needs are concerned. The author of the present grammar has held the lectureship in London since it was instituted in 1918, and the book he has put out is the fruit of four years experience in the teaching of Swedish to Englishmen, with the emphasis upon the things that the English have found most troublesome. Simultaneously with the grammar there was issued a *First Swedish Book* also, but this I do not yet possess; however, according to the 'Preface' of the present work it is planned as a complement to the grammar 'with practical exercises in reading, conversation, writing, etc.' The author expresses the hope (in an accompanying letter) that his book may come to be used also in American colleges. It will, therefore, be proper to review it in an American journal; though I shall do so only very briefly, confining myself to the general plan of the work, and certain points that have been noted in the first reading of it.

The first forty-seven pages are devoted to the pronunciation. And here I am glad to see that the Swedish musical accent is not relegated to a paragraph or two, but is considered in some detail (six pages), and illustrated by rising and falling straight lines, and by curved lines in a way that should be very helpful to the beginner. The grammar proper devotes seventy-eight pages to the declensions, and fifty-eight to the verb and its use; the last twenty pages are given to the adverb, conjunction, prepositions, and the order of words. There is a Table of Sounds in Swedish, and two diagrams intended to define more in detail the differences between Swedish and English vowels. The best feature of the book is the full and clear discussion of the sounds, and particularly repeating in this part of the book, in phonetic transcription, every Swedish word that is cited. The extensive illustrative material under nouns and verbs must also be commended, as the complete listing of the plural forms of irregular noun groups. Much less satisfactory is the presentation of the use of prepositions in Swedish.

The following matters seem to me to call for a comment:

P. 16. The author says correctly that the retroflex *s* resembles the English *sh*-sound, but is formed further back. Now insofar

as the retroflex *s* and the Swedish *sh*-sound coincide only in some parts of Sweden, and are otherwise distinctly different, the retroflex *s* being a supradental *s,* it seems to me that it was unfortunate (and will, to the beginner, sometimes be misleading), to represent the supradental *s* and *sh*-sound by the same symbol (ṣ). It will trouble the learner to find that *s* in *kors* and *skinn* are not pronounced alike, and yet the two words are transcribed *koṣ* and *ṣin.*

P. 17. We read "*K,* g and ŋ (*ng*) are pronounced as in English, except before a front vowel and in a final position, where they become palatalized, i. e., their point of articulation is moved much further forward." Since it is not a question here of the change of *k* to the palatal *c*(*ch*) and *g* to *j* (consonantal *y*), but merely the fronting of a velar, it would have been better to avoid the word 'palatalized,' and to say 'fronted.'

P. 24. The transcription of *journal* is given with an *o*-vowel for the *-ou-*. This is possibly a misprint, for the author, no doubt, also pronounces *ʃurnal,* as, too, it is given in Lyttkens och Wulff.

P. 34. The statement under 5 that 'in many words the length of the consonant is not indicated in the spelling. This is especially the case with *m* and *n,*' is a little unsatisfactory to the student. It would be better to say that between vowels *m* and *n* are regularly written double; exceptions are *amen,* and the words *domen* and *domare.* On the other hand *m* and *n* are regularly not written double finally; to this there are few exceptions (as *damm,* 'dust,' *lamm,* 'land,' *ramm,* 'ram,' and *tunn,* 'thin,' *sann,* 'true' *skinn,* 'skin,' and the preterites *hann*(*hinna*), *fann*(*finna*), *brann*(*brinna*), and other vbs. in *-nn-*.

P. 58. The use of the definite forms in Swedish under § 27 and § 28 could be grouped and explained, as e. g., *hela dagen* and with a limited group of adjectives: *hel, halv, först, sist, slätt,* where the def. article is understood in Swedish (Eng. the whole day, the first time, etc.). Similarly: *han stoppade handen i fickan* belongs with the use of nouns referring to parts of the body or wearing apparel, in which the def. article in Swedish corresponds to the possessive in English.

P. 72. It is possible to help the student by specifying two general rules regarding what nouns belong in the Third Declension. First, it is the declension of foreign nouns, whether of one or more

syllables; second it is the declension of abstracts. Further, common gender monosyllabic nouns ending in a consonant belong here if they modify the root vowel in the plural, but this to be sure, is not a very helpful rule, since it assumes knowledge of something the rule should aid the student in ascertaining.

P. 98. The form *e(d)er* given as the alternate of *eder* is of course a misprint for *e(de)r*.

P. 130. The classifying of all verbs under four conjugations according to the supine ending: *-at, -t, -tt, -it,* as the characteristic, works some confusion, applied as here. It necessitates grouping some strong verbs under the three first (i. e., weak) conjugations, as *kunna, veta,* and *vilja* under the 1st, and *bedja, dö, få, gå, le, se, stå,* and *slå,* under the 3rd. It seems better and clearer to me to keep the classification under the preterite formation, in which some weak and several strong verbs will have an irregular supine form. It certainly will not do to give *slå–slog–slogo–slagit,* as an irregular vb. of the Third Conjugation (§ 208), while on § 213, *draga–drog–drogo–dragit,* and *hålla–höll–hölle–hållit,* are given as strong; *slå* should be given with these.

Pp. 154-161. The discussion of the Passive Voice is good and possibly everywhere clear. Under the passive voice of verbs of transition such an example as *ljusen tändas och julklapparna utdelas,* rendered 'the candles are lighted, and the Christmas gifts are distributed,' would perhaps better have been rendered 'The candles are being lighted and the Christmas gifts distributed'; and similarly in some other cases.

Under Adverbs and Prepositions I would have preferred a different grouping of some things; and particularly one which would have shown the reason for the Swedish use. As it stands it must often appear to the beginner that the adverbs and prepositions of Swedish are a maze of irregularities, and that any preposition, e. g., can mean most anything. But, as a matter of fact, it is just as often, if not more often, the English use that needs explanation. So e. g., "Have you any money *about* you?" "Mind what you are *about*." "There is no pride *about* him," to take three of the examples under 'about.' I shall not go into this, however, here.

I do not wish to give the impression that the above are very important matters that weigh against the usefulness of the book. They are, after all, but relatively minor matters in comparison

with the many excellent features. The fundamentals of the grammar are clearly presented, notes on exceptional things, colloquial pronunciation, etc., are reduced to a minimum; particularly is to be commended the way the illustrative paradigms are printed, with the characteristic of the class or group set in black-face type, and similarly sometimes that in which the Swedish expression differentiates itself from the English. The book is printed with clean type, on excellent paper and gives a most pleasing appearance; it is attractively bound. The publishers are to be congratulated on getting out such an attractive book, as is the author on its general excellence. I hope that it may find many users also in this country.

University of Illinois. GEORGE T. FLOM.

Märchen und Traum, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Orients, von GEORG JACOB. Hannover, Orient-Buchhandlung Heinz Lafaire, 1923. 112 pp. (*Beiträge zur Märchenkunde des Morgenlandes,* herausgg. v. Georg Jacob und Theodor Menzel. I. Band.)

It is encouraging that even under present conditions books like the present are turned out in Central Europe, although outsiders will hardly surmise the greatness of the sacrifice on the part of both author and publisher.

Mr. Jacob attempts to give an outline of the close relationship between dream and fairy tale. In estimating the importance of dreams for primitive fiction he follows in the steps of Ludwig Laistner and Friedrich von der Leyen, to say nothing of Sigmund Freud and his school. With them he has in common the basic theory that many Märchen are an interpretation and reworking of dream experience in the light of a state of waking (pp. 5 and 43). His illustrations are frequently but not exclusively taken from Oriental literatures and Oriental collections of fairy tales. Appended to the work is a copious bibliography, in which, curiously enough, English works are altogether absent, with the exception of Miss Cox's *Cinderella* and Tawney's translation of Somadeva.

As a specialist in Oriental literatures Mr. Jacob is inclined to overrate, perhaps, the influence of the Orient on Western fiction and folklore; many of the resemblances and parallels in Mediæval

Europe and the Near East adduced (pp. 8 ff.) doubtless deserve to be reëxamined. On p. 26 he rightly protests against the assumption that all fairy tales are derived from myths. But it seems questionable whether the Samson story originated in a nature myth as the author believes with the older school of mythologists (pp. 25-26). As has been pointed out by Sir J. G. Frazer,[1] the legend is based on the Märchen type of the External Soul (Life Index Motif). The sun myth in the Samson story (and its existence cannot be doubted in view of the proper names of hero and heroine) must then be secondary. A similar reservation must be made for the story of Adam and Eve, in which the author sees sex-psychological forces at work (p. 50). It cannot be doubted that the story in the form in which it entered the Old Testament canon contains such a sexual element; but at the same time it is safe to say that here again we have to deal with a secondary development. As a matter of fact, Sir J. G. Frazer convincingly proved with a wealth of material collected from all over the earth that the serpent owes its rôle in the Hebrew myth to the well-nigh universal belief in the immortality of serpents, a belief which is based upon the fact that serpents cast off their old skin.[2] Connected with this ancient belief is the wide-spread story of the animal messenger who either wilfully or by mistake deprives man of immortality, keeping it for himself.[3] The tree of life and the tree of knowledge were originally the tree of life and the tree of death, and the cunning serpent persuaded poor Eve to eat of the latter, whereas he himself ate of the tree of life, thereby winning immortality. It is clear that the change of the tree of death into a tree of knowledge is connected with the intrusion of the sexual element in the story, and this change can have occurred only in a sufficiently sophisticated age, when the meaning of the old tale had been forgotten, an age impregnated with ascetic doctrines themselves foreign to Judaism.

The great rôle of dreams in the history of mankind is rightly insisted upon (p. 85). The derivation of Germanic *drauma* from *draugma* (p. 38) is therefore very doubtful, especially if we remember the part played by dreams in Old Norse literature, where

[1] Sir J. G. Frazer, *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament*, London, 1918, II, 484.
[2] *Ibid.*, I, 49; Apollodorus, *The Library*, London, 1921, II, 44.
[3] Frazer, *Folk-Lore*, I, 213; O. Dähnhardt, *Natursagen*, Leipzig, 1910, III, 22.

they are always an exact reflection of coming events. The peculiar lack of initiative which characterizes many Märchen heroes is owing to the absence of will in dreams (p. 48). However, the common desire for a *dolce far niente* would, I think, account for it in many cases.

The theme of a man being taken to another country or another world and spending there eventful years, only to find, upon his return, that but a few seconds have passed since his departure (pp. 69 f.) is a favorite mediæval motive, being found in the eleventh tale of Juan Manuel's *Conde Lucanor,* in two Icelandic stories of Jón Halldórsson,[4] in the twenty-eighth story of the *Novellino* (ed. Biagi, p. 36), and in the Old Irish legend of Laegaire mac Aimthainn's visit to the fairy realm of Mag Mell.[5] It doubtless originated with dream experience. But the same cannot be said in regard to the other motive where the hero, upon his return from the other world, finds his generation dead and gone and himself an old man, though he thought he had spent but a short time, generally a few hours, in the abode of bliss (p. 72). This motive is not usually found in dream experience; it is rather based on the notion that time flies in the happy spirit land by analogy with the rare hours of happiness here on earth, and few will contend, I believe, that the idea of the happy Otherworld, and hence all higher forms of religion, are derived from dream experience alone.

For the motive of the *Schwabenstreich* in Uhland's *Schwäbische Kunde* it is unnecessary to assume Oriental sources (p. 91); it occurs rather frequently in mediæval chronicles and works of fiction,[6] also in folktales.[7]

[4] H. Gering, *Islendzk Aeventyri*, Halle, 1882, I, 227 and 256.

[5] A. Nutt, *The Voyage of Bran*, London, 1895, I, 180 ff.

[6] Guil. Malm. l. IV, cap. 2, A. D. 1100. *Roland*, ll. 1133-5; 1325-34, 1370-5, 1584-9, 1644-50. *Voy. de Charlemagne*, ed. Koschwitz, ll. 453-464. *Gormand et Isembard*, cf. R. Zenker, *Das Epos von Isembard und Gormund*, Halle, 1896, p. 10. W. A. Clouston, *Popular Tales and Fictions*, Edinburgh, 1887, I, 42, *Þiðreks Saga*, ed. Unger, cap. 400. Cf. also the combat of Bardas Skleros with a Russian chief in G. Schlumberger, *L'Epopée byzantine à la fin du dixième siècle*, t. I, Paris, 1896, p. 55.

[7] W. Hertz, *Deutsche Sage im Elsass*, Stuttgart, 1872, p. 277; K. Müllenhoff, *Sagen, Märchen und Lieder der Herzogtümer Schleswig-Holstein und Lauenburg*, Kiel, 1845, p. 29; F. S. Krauss, *Slavische Volksforschungen*, Leipzig, 1908, p. 363.

The author's illustrations might be profitably enlarged to broaden the basis of the inquiry. The best example in literature of the terrible resuscitation scene (p. 40) which is doubtless due to dream experience, is that of Schiller's *Räuber,* where it also assumes the form of a dream. A good illustration of skillful and accurate use of a dream in short story literature (p. 41) is *El Pajaro en la Nieve* by A. Palacio Valdés. There the blind boy experiences in a dream what constitutes his only hope, his brother's return. Of the woman's reaction against her own growing passion (pp. 49 ff.) Benavente's powerful play *La Mal Querida* furnishes a good example. The motive of the "double" (doubtless due to dream experience, as the author suggests, pp. 64 ff.) occurs in numerous devil stories [8] and also in W. Hauff's *Die Memoiren des Satan.*

Among the Märchen which doubtless go back to dreams (p. 78) mention should be made of one occurring in one of the Oriental versions of the *Seven Sages.*[9] There the hero, the servant of a number of one-eyed old men, opens a forbidden door, and is carried by a bird to a land of bliss where he marries the queen. Again he opens a forbidden door, and the same bird carries him back to the former place, there depriving him of one eye.

Among the instances of artistic inspiration through dreams (p. 94) the legend of Caedmon as told by Bede (*Hist. Eccl.,* 1. IV, cap. 24) should have been mentioned.

The book distinguishes itself by its neat appearance and faultless print—I have noticed just one misprint, on p. 17, where the reading should be *Bolte.* It is to be hoped that the following works of the series will come up to the same high standards.

ALEXANDER HAGGERTY KRAPPE.

University of Minnesota.

---

[8] *Am Ur-Quell,* IV (1893), p. 115.

[9] It occurs in the *Seven Viziers* (V, 1). Cf. Clouston, *The Book of Sindibad* (1884), p. 17; *Popular Tales and Fictions,* I, 199; Benfey, *Pantschatantra,* Leipzig, 1859, I, 154; Nerucci, *Sessanta Novelle popolari montalesi,* Firenze, 1891, No. 9.

Maria Chapdelaine par LOUIS HEMON. Edited with introduction, notes, questionnaire, exercises, and vocabulary by HUGO P. THIEME. New York: Macmillan, 1923. xxviii + 262 pp.

Maria Chapdelaine is one of the best French novels written since Maupassant on French peasant life. It was called "roman exotique," "roman canadien," but in fact it is a product of the spirit of regionalism which, reacting against the crude materialism of Balzac's peasant figures and the prejudiced attacks of Zola on the farmer, has invaded the French novel. In one respect *Maria Chapdelaine* even surpasses Maupassant's stories: it completes the *œuvre* of Flaubert's greatest disciple whose inspiration was not strong enough to create, besides immortal anecdotes, a true epic of the French soil.

The moral elevation of Hémon's novel would make it excellent material for class use if obstacles of a serious nature did not present themselves. The editor mentions in his preface that "there was naturally a temptation to make a detailed study of Canadian French," but, and for good reason, "no attempt has been made to study even the essential characteristics of Canadian French." The editor's method is to translate "freely very unusual passages and all other matter is treated in the vocabulary." Outside of Anglicisms, archaic locutions, and archaic pronunciation Canadian French is not very divergent from certain Northern French dialects—especially that of Normandy—which have been often reproduced in French fiction. But in a school edition like this, if the "detailed" study of the dialect is omitted, at least specific Canadian and other dialectal locutions should have been very carefully noted either in the notes or in the vocabulary. It most certainly misleads the student if the vocabulary states without further explanation that "dépareillé" means "matchless," or gives without indicating their peculiarity words like "la boucane," "à la brunante," "la couverte"; "le coureur-des-bois," meaning "chasseur, trappeur," not "woodsman"; "cru," meaning "damp and cold"; "dépouillé," meaning "lifeless"; "disputer," which on the other side of the Ocean does not mean "to scold"; "faraud," according to Littré and Bescherelle "fat de mauvais ton," but in Canada "cavalier," while the vocabulary gives only the adjectival meaning which does not fit into the text; "gaudriole," not exactly "mixed grain," but

"bran mixed with water, a kind of fodder"; "gazette," antiquated in France, used only in certain traditional titles, as "Gazette de France, Gazette de Cologne"; "le godendard"; "l'habitant"; "la jarre," not "jar," but "small water barrel"; "approprié" for French "conforme, propre à la circonstance"; "ataca," "atteler," in the meaning of "harnacher." The editor might well have used one of the numerous Canadian-French dictionaries,—like that of Sylva Clapin, Montréal, 1894—and in that case he would have better translated "badrant," "bardasser," "boucane," "robe de carriole" and some of the vocables already quoted. The notes do not help the student much in understanding the text. Very often they show that the explanation was made at random:

Page 9: "Er" as form of address does not show "respect and reverence" in modern German, on the contrary! Page 31: "le sol canadien ne faisait que se débarrasser avec effort de son manteau d'hiver" does not mean "*only* with the greatest effort could rid itself of" but "*just* rid itself of. . . ." Page 59: The editor forgets that the definite article before "on" is not only "euphonic," but historical, too, and is used at the beginning of sentences, as well as in the combinations "si l'on, où l'on." Page 143: "je vas" is not colloquial, but a vulgarism, archaic and provincial. Page 144: "Eutrope prit dans une de ses poches et ouvrit lentement une petite boite" is translated: ". . . *put his hand into one of his pockets,* took out and slowly opened, . . ." why the long circumlocution? Page 156: "vous avez-t-y" is not "colloquial," but vulgar; "c'est-y" is not "c'est," but "est-ce?" In short, the notes are insufficient and the editor seldom distinguishes between Canadian and French usage.

The French of the exercises and questionnaires added to the novel is far from being irreproachable: "imitez leur conversation" for "répétez . . . ;" "que voulait . . . ne pas permettre," for "que ne voulait-il pas permettre" (185); "le nom Charles Eugène" for "le nom de Charles Eugène" (186); "le soir de rentrée de Maria" for "le soir de la rentrée de Maria" (187); "rester" for "demeurer, vivre"; "la condition du climat" for "les conditions du climat"; "quand la fête de sainte Anne a-t-elle lieu" is incorrect—"une fête tombe" in French (189); "suggérer" meaning "proposer" is English or Canadian French (196); "quel fut l'effet de Lorenzo sur la compagnie" for "quelle

impression Lorenzo fit-il sur la compagnie" (197); "mettre une tentation devant quelqu'un" is not French (198); "rendez compte" for "racontez" (198); the editor forgets that there is no substantive like "avant-midi" in French (100) and vocabulary, it is Canadian; in literary French "matin, matinée" are the only words for "forenoon"; "que voulait dire la vie pour Maria" (201) is not French; "la réponse de la question" should be "la réponse à la question" (201); the words "incrédule" and "incroyable" are mixed in the question "quelle phrase trouve-t-elle un peu incrédule?" (196).

If we add that the vocabulary quotes "délice" (sing.) as fem.; makes "pouce" fem. when meaning "inch"; translates "mesquin" by "trivial," does not distinguish between "poitrine" and "poitrail," explains "malavenant" by "malvenant" and "malvenu," that many a misprint disfigures the text and the vocabulary, we may state that there is great need for a new edition of this masterpiece.

Marquette University. A. STEINER.

First Phonetic French Course. By CHURCHMAN and HACKER. Heath and Co., 1923.

Those who are fervent believers in the teaching of phonetics, and their number is continually increasing, will welcome the appearance of this new little volume. Its authors have had long experience with the study of phonetics and I shall not attempt to analyze in detail their treatment of the subject. I should like to make a few remarks, wholly practical, concerning *method.*

The *First French Course* limits itself entirely to giving the text in phonetic symbols. Only in the vocabularies of its sixteen lessons do we see words in French spelling, and then in parentheses. So far so good. But how about the passing over to reading from standard spelling? I know that the enemies of the phonetic method have been objecting that the student makes a confusion of phonetic and standard spelling, that therein lies the great difficulty. I must say that in the few years of my experience with teaching phonetics I have perhaps had *two* cases of a student saying *le* (phonetic spelling) instead of *lə* when confronted with the standard spelling *le.* This is about the extent of confusion I have

found in my own classes. On the contrary, the reading of a given text in phonetic spelling, mastering that text, then passing over to the *same* text in standard spelling, first with the phonetic text open beside the other, gives excellent results. The student finds added interest in his work when he can make the comparison between the two texts, he eagerly watches for all peculiarities, such as liaisons, denasalizing of vowels, the pronunciation of *d* as *t,* when linked, etc. Phonetic symbols then become something extremely alive, primarily important.

Perhaps, when teaching very young children, when there is plenty of time ahead, a primer in phonetic symbols only may be found perfectly satisfactory, and yet even under those circumstances I doubt the efficiency of such a method. No matter how scientific we should like to be, we must also think of the practical side of the question, of how to get the best results, of how to stimulate the interest of the pupil so as to accomplish those results.

Occasionally a student asks the following question at the very beginning of the first year French course: "What is the use of studying phonetic symbols, reading from phonetic texts when eventually we must naturally read from books in standard spelling?" That question is never asked after the first or second lesson, for the student then realizes the value of the phonetic text since it is compared immediately with the standard text. If, however, the student, at the beginning of his French instruction, is kept day after day to the phonetic text I am afraid his interest will lag, to say nothing of the fact that experience has proved that the best results are obtained only when the phonetic passage is followed by the reading of the same passage in the standard spelling. It seems to me that the volume in question would have much more practical value if the authors reproduced, either in an appendix or side by side with the phonetic transcription, the corresponding standard spelling of the same passage. More exercises such as those on page 18, *Common Phrases,* but with the standard spelling instead of the English translation, would be worth adding to the book.

The treatment of sounds is excellent. In such a comprehensive study it might be worth while saying something about the difference between French and English *p* and *b* for we all know that the difference is marked. But this is a minor detail.

Teachers College, Columbia University. HÉLÈNE HARVITT.

CORRESPONDENCE

NOTES ON LYLY'S *Euphues*

The following notes are offered as a supplement to the discussion of Lyly's sources, *Mod. Lang. Notes,* XXXIII, 334-42, XXXIV, 121-22. They are made with reference to two editions of the *Euphues* (by M. W. Croll, 1916, and R. W. Bond, 1902).

P. 38 (B. I, 204). "The stone of Sicilia, the which the more it is beaten, the harder it is." Cp., perhaps, Propertius, I, 16, 29, "sit licet et saxo patientior illa Sicano"—where the Latin allusion is about as obscure as Lyly's.

P. 64 (B. I, 223). "If the fierce bull be tamed with the fig-tree." Add Pliny, *N. H.* XXIII, 64, 130, "caprificus tauros quamlibet feroces collo eorum circumdata in tantum mirabili natura compescit, ut immobiles praestet."

P. 109 (B. I, 258). "The fire-stone in Liguria . . . is kindled with water." Cp. Pliny, *N. H.* XXXVII, 7, 99, "Est et anthracitis . . . falsum arbitror quod et in Liguria nasci prodiderunt . . . aquis perfusae exardescunt."

P. 119 (B. I, 266). The "etymology of mother among the Grecians" should be printed "*meter a me terein.*"

P. 120 (B. I, 267). "And be kept from barbarous talk as the ship from rocks." Cp., perhaps, Aulus Gellius, I, 10, "ut tamquam scopulum, sic fugias inauditum atque insolens verbum."

P. 165 (B. I, 307). "Milo, that great wrestler began to weep when he saw his arms brawnfallen and weak, saying, 'Strength, strength is but vanity.' Helen, in her new glass viewing her old face, with a smiling countenance cried, 'Beauty, where is thy blaze?'" A Euphuistic paraphrase of Ovid, *Met.* XV, 229-33.

> fletque Milon senior, cum spectat inanes
> illos, qui fuerant solidorum mole tororum
> Herculeis similes, fluidos pendere lacertos.
> flet quoque, ut in speculo rugas aspexit aniles,
> Tyndaris et secum, cur sit bis rapta, requirit.

P. 173 (B. I, 314). "Every place a country to a wise man." Add Seneca, *Ad Helviam,* IX, 7, "omnem locum sapienti viro patriam esse," and the saying of Theophrastus, Vitruvius, vi, praef., "doctum . . . in omni civitate esse civem."

P. 192 (B. II, 3). "The musician, who, being entreated, will scarce sing," etc. Cp. Horace, *Sat.* I, 3, 1-3, "Omnibus hoc vitium est cantoribus," etc.

Pp. 194, 277, 283 (B. II, 5, 73, 77). "The twins of Hippocrates." See *Mod. Lang. Notes,* XXXVIII, 313.

P. 226 (B. II, 31). "At thy coming into England be not too inquisitive of news, neither curious in matters of state." Cicero,

De Offic. I, 34, 125, "peregrini autem atque incolae officium est, nihil praeter suum negotium agere, nihil de alio inquirere minimeque esse in aliena re publica curiosum."

P. 325 (B. II, 111). "I am torn upon the wheel with Ixion, my liver gnawn of the vultures and harpies." A blend of the stories of Ixion and Tityos.

P. 373 (B. II, 152). "That none ought at any time so to love that he should find it in his heart at any time to hate." Cicero, *De Amic.* XVI, 59 (the saying attributed to Bias of Priene) "ita amare oportere, ut si aliquando esset osurus."

W. P. MUSTARD.

Johns Hopkins University.

UNPUBLISHED EPIGRAMS BY J. B. LULLY

The renowned musician J. B. Lully (1633-87) was, his Italian origin notwithstanding, occasionally guilty of an epigram or a song in French. Almost nothing of his verse has escaped destruction. The *Oeuvres de Chaulieu* (1777, II, p. 92) contain a *Couplet de Chanson de Lully pour Mlle de R . . .*, with a *Réponse Inpromptu* by Chaulieu, in which Lully's moral character is not spared. His contemporary reputation as a libertine is further explained by the nature of some of his poems, printed by F. Lachèvre in his *Bibliogr. des Recueils coll.* (III, 429, 523). They are addressed to his friends Lachapelle and Saint Pavin and entirely in the habitual note of these "émules d'Anacréon."

"Le Florentin Jean-Baptiste Lully,
Que de Phébus conçut Dame Harmonie,
Pour les bons mots avoit tant de génie,
Que je voudrois en avoir recueilli
Des mieux choisis! A son compatriote
Le sale Pogge, il damoit le pion. . . . ."
(Sénécé, *Le présent ruineux, Epigrammes et autres Pièces*, p. 189.)

A MS. *Recueil de Vaudevilles* of the end of the seventeenth century, in my possession, has preserved six epigrams by Lully, of which I print here five. I suppress the sixth, which rivals the *Chansons de Blot* in licenciousness.

Recueil de Vaudevilles, Vol. v, F. 145:

Sur Du Pontel par Lully.

Aimable Du Pontel,
Si les Dieux m'en croyoient, tu serois immortel:
Ganymède autrefois pour moins fut rendu tel.

Lully sur Ninon.

Trop aimable Ninon.
Vous avez trop d'esprit pour vouloir dire non,
Le plaisir du péché vaut mieux que le pardon.

Lully sur la Moreau qui faisoit Scilla dans l'Opéra de Galathée.

Vous scavez bien Scilla,
La pomme que Paris à Venus présenta,
Elle eut esté pour vous, mais vous n'estiez pas là.

Le Même à la Duchesse de la Ferté.

Aimable la Ferté.
Qui vous voit un moment est pour jamais charmé,
Moy, qui suis Florentin, je change de costé.

Le Même à la Sublique, fameuse danseuse de l'Opéra.

Ah! Je vois dans vos yeux
Voltiger un enfant plus beau que tous les dieux:
Ne luy refusez rien et vous danserez mieux.

GUSTAVE L. VAN ROOSBROECK.

New York University.

GAUTIER, QUINET, AND THE NAME "MOB"

There are at least two places in the writings of Théophile Gautier where he applies the name "Mob" to a personification of death. Such is the interpretation that two American scholars give for this name. In publishing the poem *Vieux de la Vielle* (1850) in his *French Lyrics of the XIXth Century* (1913), Professor G. N. Henning makes this comment (p. 374), on line 28:

> "Avec ses dents jaunes de tartre,
> Son crâne de mousse verdi,
> A Paris, boulevard Montmartre,
> Mob se montrant en plein midi!

"Line 28. 'Mob': perhaps another form of 'Mab,' though Gautier's lugubrious figure hardly matches the tricksome fairy. In 'Jettatura,' ch. xi, Gautier uses 'Mob' as a synonym of 'Death'; probably so here also."

In Professor A. Schinz' edition of *Jettatura* (1856), dated 1900, a note to the same effect is given on p. 138, explaining this phrase from chap. xi: "C'est aux plus jeunes et aux plus belles que la vieille Mob en veut." "The old Mob = death" (p. 138).

This is the exact meaning of this word if Gautier alludes in these passages to one of the *dramatis personae* of Edgar Quinet's mystic prose-poem *Ahasvérus* (1833). During the third "journée," at the beginning of part II, Death is introduced as an actor in these words: "La Mort sous le nom de Mob, vieille femme qui se chauffe dans les cendres." After this introduction, "Mob" always plays her part in the drama under that name.

Ahasvérus is almost grotesquely romantic, and would not easily be forgotten by the author of *Les Jeunes-France* who was twenty-two when Quinet's "mystery" was published. Now, was the name "Mob" coined by Quinet; suggested perhaps by words like Job, mort, Mab, morgue or Moab? Had he heard of Shelley's *Queen Mab,* in which Ahasuerus also appears? Even after considerable searching, the word remains an enigma.

WILLIAM LEONARD SCHWARTZ.

Stanford University.

TWO BOOKS INSCRIBED BY ANATOLE FRANCE

The time is not far distant when every scattered idea from the pen of Anatole France will be collected and treasured. Admirers of the Dean of French prose writers will no doubt be interested in the following lines, in the handwriting of M. France, found upon the title pages of two first editions of his books, now in the Chapin collection of rare books in the Williams College Library.

On the title-page of *Le Puits de Sainte Claire:*

"Il est singulier mais juste de dire que la doctrine de Saint François d'Assise est la pure doctrine socialiste. Avant même la mort du délicieux Saint, il ne subsistait plus rien de son œuvre. L'esprit en était changé.

Juillet, 1902."

On the title-page of *Pierre Nozière:*

"Pour Monsieur James Yung" (James Carleton Young? Anatole France does not know English, and seems to be somewhat proud of the fact)

"L'avenir est un lieu commode pour y mettre des songes. C'est là, comme en Utopie, que le sage se plaît à bâtir. Je veux croire que les peuples se feront un jour de paisibles vertus."

Gustave Michaut, who has found pleasure (and some success) in pointing out repetitions in the work of Anatole France would, I think, have some difficulty in finding this idea expressed by him in a similar form. The nearest parallel which I recall is the famous line from *Vers les Temps meilleurs:*

"Lentement, mais toujours, l'humanité réalise les rêves des sages."

DAVID C. CABEEN.

Williams College.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF *l'Elève de Terpsicore*

It is pointed out in Professor Zeek's *Louis de Boissy*[1] that, although the authorship of *l'Elève de Terpsicore,*[2] published anonymously in 1718, has been generally ascribed to de Boissy, there has been considerable hesitancy in believing him to be the author. The evidence on each side is indicated, and an extract from the notes of the editor Prault is quoted, which apparently confirms the opinion that de Boissy did write this collection of satires.

Further support of this conclusion is furnished by a passage from an interesting brochure, printed early in the year after the publication of *l'Elève de Terpsicore,* entitled *Le Journal Satirique Intercepté.*[3] It is especially to be noted that de Boissy is called "l'auteur" rather than "l'éditeur," a term applied to him by later literary historians.[4] The passage in part is as follows: "Ce fut dans ce temps-là que M. l'Abbé de Boissy[5]—résolut de châtier ce satirique[6] par une satire des plus galantes et des plus ingénieuses. C'est un petit livre en deux volumes intitulé *l'Elève de Terpsicore.* Il est vrai que l'auteur n'est point l'Abbé de Boissy, célèbre Docteur de Sorbonne, car il n'a pas encore vingt ans."[7] Moreover, in 1724, he was called "ce Nourrisson de Terpsicore" in an epigram by Gacon.[8]

The evidence contained in these hitherto unnoticed passages is much earlier than any to which Professor Zeek refers, and establishes the fact that, in 1719—immediately after the appearance of the work—and also in 1724, de Boissy was known as its author.[9]

GEO. B. WATTS.

University of Minnesota.

---

[1] Grenoble, 1914, p. 222.

[2] *L'Elève de Terpsicore ou le Nourisson de la Satire,* Amsterdam, 1718.

[3] Paris, 1719, p. 6. Concerning the authorship of this brochure see my article, "Voltaire's Change of Name," in *M. L. N.*, XXXVIII, 329.

[4] Michaud, *Biographie Universelle,* IV, 594; *La Grande Encyclopédie,* VII, 161; Vapereau, *Dict. Univ. des Litt.*, p. 290.

[5] Before devoting himself to a literary career, de Boissy had studied for the ministry and had worn the cloth. This accounts for the use, by contemporaries, of the title "l'Abbé de Boissy." Cf. Zeek, *op. cit.*, p. 5; Voltaire, *Œuvres* (Moland), I, 300.

[6] Gacon. In a later publication I intend to discuss the quarrel between de Boissy and Gacon.

[7] In 1718 de Boissy was twenty-four. To distinguish Louis de Boissy from another, then famous, Abbé de Boissy, the author goes on to explain that the former, although young, had no less sense than the most famous doctors of the Sorbonne.

[8] *Suite du Secrétaire du Parnasse,* Paris, 1724, p. 41.

[9] For other early eighteenth century attributions of authorship to de Boissy, see Goujet, *Bibliothèque fr.*, IV, 130; V, 184.

An Early Sixteenth-Century Critical Treatise

The first item in a list of *Italian Critical Treatises of the Sixteenth Century* compiled by Mr. R. C. Williams (*Modern Language Notes*, xxxv, 506-507): *1522. Campiano, N. B., In Artem poeticam Primordia. Venetiis*, may seem puzzling even to students of sixteenth-century criticism. Strictly speaking, this little treatise does not belong in that list, but it is sufficiently early and sufficiently interesting in itself to be identified and brought to the attention of scholars at large.

The title-page reads as follows: "F. Navseae Blancicampiani in artem poeticen, carminumque condendorum primordia. Eiusdem syntagma de conficiendis epistolis. (Colophon:) Impressum Venetiis per Gregorium de Gregoriis. Anno M.D.XXII. die XVI Maii." There are 115 sheets, numbered recto only, and one unnumbered sheet. There are copies in the British Museum (*11312. aaa. 33*), in Madrid (Biblioteca Nacional, *R–18534*), in Berlin (former Königliche Bibliothek, *Berol. Xa. 921*), and apparently also in Munich.

This little treatise is little known. Creizenach mentions it, but one will look vainly for it in Saintsbury or Spingarn or Borinski. The encyclopedic Grässe (v, 677) mentions it as published in Venice, 1522(?) and 1552, but I have found no trace of an edition of 1552, and this is probably a mistake. Grässe calls the author Friedrich Nausea, *i. e.*, Eckel or Unrath, alias Grew or Grau, from Pleichfeld or Weissenfeld near Würzburg, hence Blancicampianus or Bianco-Campiano, and in Mr. Williams's list, N. B. Campiano! The year of his death is given, erroneously, as 1550. According to Jöcher (*Gelehrtenlexicon*), Nausea, doctor of theology and laws, secretary to Cardinal Campeggio, preacher at the Stiftskirche in Mainz, preacher and counselor to Emperor Ferdinand, finally in 1541 bishop of Vienna, died at a great age in 1552. Neither Jöcher nor Jöcher-Adelung mentions the *Primordia*. The *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie* adds that Nausea studied in Leipzig, went as tutor of a young nobleman to Italy in 1518, and also that he composed in 1521-22 an art of poetry entitled *Syntagma de conficiendis epistolis!* He obtained his doctor's degree in 1523. More precisely, as Jos. Metzer, *Friedrich Nausea*, Regensburg, 1884, p. 18, declares, the *Primordia* were finished in Padua late in the autumn of the year 1521 during a convalescence. The young Bavarian (he speaks of "his prince," Duke William of Bavaria) mentions Baron Christophorus Schwartzenberg as his patron, and the *Primordia* are a bid for the favor of Cardinal Campeggio. It was a very interesting effort indeed, with an unmistakable stamp of originality at a time when that quality was

rare; he quotes Aristotle and Horace and, of course, the inevitable Donatus, but also Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio.

When our knowledge of early modern criticism has progressed somewhat further, when Kasenbort's *Dialogus,* the anonymous *Tractatulus* of 1500, Badius's *Prenotamenta,* and Faustus's *Libellus de comoedia* are better known, it will be interesting to situate the work of Nausea, friend and correspondent of Erasmus, among the critical efforts of the early sixteenth century.

JOSEPH E. GILLET.

Bryn Mawr College.

BRIEF MENTION

Good Speech. An Introduction to English Phonetics by Walter Ripman (pp. viii + 88. E. P. Dutton and Co., New York. 1924). This book of Mr. Ripman's is an attempt to present in popular style the elements of English phonetics. The author writes "down" to his readers throughout, sometimes, indeed, approaching the style of books written for small children. Thus, on p. 23 he tells us, "In the throat we have a very delicate apparatus, the *vocal chords,* which you cannot see with your mirror." From Mr. Ripman's *Preface* one would judge that his book was meant primarily for teachers in elementary schools, and for these it will doubtless be of some value, in England at least. Serious students of speech in this country will hardly find it particularly useful, since it was written for British readers and in its American edition has not been adapted in the slightest degree to American conditions.

A thoroughgoing consideration of the book under review would hardly be worth our while. I will therefore content myself with a short discussion of a few matters of detail. On p. 7 the author, after explaining that Standard English arose out of the London dialect, asks, "What forces have helped to spread it so widely?" His answer is a good example of what may be called the pedagogic fallacy. He says, "Much has been done by the great boarding schools for boys, taught by men of good family educated at one of the older Universities. Much is due to the great progress in the education of women." Etc., etc. These factors are hardly so important as the author believes. On p. 17, and again on p. 39, Mr. Ripman speaks of the two kinds of *l* in English; he distinguishes these as the "dark" and the "clear," as in *will* and *willing.* That there is a difference here, everyone will agree. But the difference is one of quantity rather than of quality. In both words the

l is velarized or "dark" but the velation naturally is easier to hear in *will*, where the [l] is long, than in *willing*, where it is short. On p. 19, line 25, for *or* read *of*. On p. 22 and elsewhere the author uses the unfortunate term "continuant" for those consonantal sounds to which I have given the name "strait." He tells us, "When the breath has to pass through a very narrow opening . . . we get a consonantal sound. This sound can be sustained as long as the breath lasts, and it is therefore called a *continuant*." But a "stop" too can be sustained as long as the breath lasts. On p. 27 we read that "[b, d, g] are often pronounced without any 'voice' like [p, t, k]. . ." This is true enough, but in all such cases the on- or off-glide is voiced, so that no confusion arises. On p. 28 we learn that the *p* of *empty* is mute. I must confess I always pronounce it, and my pronunciation is the only one given in the *NED*. On p. 40 the author equates the voiceless [j] in *hue* with the *ch* of German *ich*. I cannot agree to this identification. To my ear the English sound differs markedly from the German. The area of articulation is much greater in German than in English, and somewhat further forward. The articulation is looser, the amount of air released is much greater and the spread of tongue, so to speak, is far more pronounced. On p. 48 we learn that the *a* of *father* is not a back vowel. The author does not make it altogether clear just how he would classify the sound; presumably he would call it "mixed." Such heterodoxy is not in place in a popular book; it is sure to confuse the reader, at the very least, and will hardly be endorsed by many phoneticians. On p. 50 we are told that the distinction between such words as *morning* and *mourning, horse* and *hoarse*, is not made in standard speech. Yet in the *NED* a sharp distinction in pronunciation is made in all such cases. Mr. Ripman's dictum will certainly be accepted nowhere in America, not to speak of Scotland and Northern England, and such a dictum makes painfully apparent the narrowness and rigidity of the author's conception of standard speech. On p. 55 the word *honesty* is transliterated [ɔnəstɪ]. I should pronounce it rather [ɔnɪstɪ], and here again I find myself in agreement with the *NED*. On p. 56 we read that to stress *aristocrat* on the second syllable is as out of date as it would be to stress the *-co-* of *balcony*. As I have always pronounced *aristocrat* with the stress on the second syllable, I was somewhat astonished to learn how much behind the times I had always been. But upon looking the word up in the *NED* I was reassured to find that that authority, at least, recognizes my pronunciation.

K. M.

A Most Friendly Farewell to Sir Francis Drake by Henry Robarts. Transcribed with a short Introduction by E. M. Blackie, B. A. (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1924). This volume is a reprint of the copy (one of two known copies in existence) in the Library of Lincoln Cathedral. It has been handsomely printed "under the supervision of Bruce Rogers" ; the typography of the original pamphlet has been reproduced "as closely as modern types will permit."

To students the brief *Farewell*—the occasion of which was Drake's expedition to the West Indies in 1585—will perhaps be chiefly interesting for its meter, since the "rhyming farewells" in uninspired hexameters furnish another instance of the popularity of this metrical form in that age (cf. B. M. Hollowell, "The Elizabethan Hexametrists," *Philological Quarterly,* III (1924), 51 ff.). The diction offers nothing of unusual importance, though several archaic words occur. A good mediaeval touch is "that rare knight Sir Francis Drake."

E. P. K.

NECROLOGY

It is with a keen sense of personal loss that the Editors of *Modern Language Notes* record the death of Professor Henry Alfred Todd of Columbia University on Saturday, January 3, 1925, in New York City. An associate editor of the *Notes* for fifteen years, from their inception in 1886 until 1900, he contributed to them, particularly during the period of his connection with Johns Hopkins University, ending in 1891, a large number of valuable articles. These include original studies on topics chiefly relating to Old French literature, as well as competent reviews of books on an extensive variety of topics—Spanish, Provençal, Italian, modern French literature, palæography, etc., besides the fields of Old French linguistics and literature, in which he was more particularly interested. His articles were always pleasantly and at times brilliantly written. An extended sketch of his work will be published by Professor J. L. Gerig in the January-March number of the *Romanic Review,* of which Professor Todd was one of the founders. American scholarship has lost in him its first editor of Old French texts, and one of the most able and prolific of such workers, a syntactician of thorough preparation and useful activity, a linguist of broad attainments and wide sympathies, an inspiring teacher and a lovable personality.

Volume XL MARCH, 1925 Number 3

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

CONTENTS

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year — Single Copy (Current) Sixty-five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of Congress of July 16, 1894

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

This publication is devoted to linguistic and literary research and to æsthetic and philosophic criticism in the domain of English, German, and the related Germanic Languages; and of French, Italian, Spanish, and the other Languages of the Romance Group. Its purpose is also to promote sound methods in the teaching of the Modern Languages and Literatures.

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is $5.00 for the United States and Mexico; Canada $5.25 and $5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union.

Contributors and Publishers will please address matter for the English Department of the *Notes* to James W. Bright; for the German Department to William Kurrelmeyer; for the French Department to H. Carrington Lancaster; for the Italian and Spanish Departments to Gustav Gruenbaum. Other matter may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief. The address of all the editors is Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

PREPARATION OF COPY

All copy should be in typewritten form.

Underscore (for italics) all titles of books, periodicals, poems, plays and other separately published compositions.

Use numerals in designating foot-notes, and number foot-notes in unbroken sequence.

Use roman numerals for volume-reference, set off by a comma before a following page-reference.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XL MARCH, 1925 NUMBER 3

LYDIAN AIRS

One of Milton's many heresies from conventional ideas was his frank desire in *L'Allegro* to be lapped "in soft Lydian airs." Throughout the Renaissance the term "Lydian" was the standard reproach for everything thought to be vicious in music. Lydian airs were the "jazz" of the time, but the name had connotations much more definitely ugly than those commonly attached to modern syncopation. What those connotations were Giraldio Cinthio tells us in his *Dialogo Secondo della vita civile:*[1]

> "Non dico però questo, perchè alle donne la Musica non convenga, ma non questa molle, non questa non meno lasciva, che si fosse già la Lydia, che parue tanto abomineuole a Platone, che non la volle accittare a modo alcuno nella sua Republica come lasciva e guastratrice di gli animi di huomini, e delle donne parimente."

It was probably from the volume of which this dialogue was a part that Shakespeare obtained his knowledge of Cinthio's *Novelle,* and M. Jusserand has given good evidence[2] that Spenser was familiar with this same dialogue of Cinthio. Certainly Spenser reflected its animus against Lydian music in his picture of Malecasta's hall:

> And all the while sweet musike did divide
> Her looser notes with Lydian harmony.[3]

Ultimately this prejudice against Lydian music goes back to the Platonic bigotry against all modes except the Dorian and to the Platonic ideal expressed by Laches of the perfect man who does not content himeslf only with the most beautiful harmony on his

[1] Second edition, Venice, 1580, p. 36.
[2] *Modern Philology*, January, 1906.
[3] *The Faerie Queene*, Book III, Canto 1, stanza 40.

lyre or on some frivolous instrument, but who, in the reality of his life, invests his words and deeds with harmony according to the Dorian mode and not according to the Ionian, much less according to the Phrygian or Lydian.[4] Milton admitted Lydian airs into his Tower of Ivory in defiance of their exclusion from the ideal republic framed by the Platonic Socrates. Why he did so is a question not very difficult, perhaps, but interesting. He was perfectly familiar, no doubt, with the passage in *The Republic* where Socrates condemns all musical modes except the Dorian on the score of their inaptness for the education of brave and temperate men, and Plato's narrow but exalted ideal of character to be set before the educator coincided very closely with his own ideal as expressed in the Tractate on Education.[5] Why, then, did he differ from Cinthio and most of his humanist predecessors and contemporaries who shared the Platonic phobia against Lydian airs?

For this there were at least two reasons of quite different kinds, and the best way to get at them is to analyze the musical prejudice inherited from Plato. Cinthio simplified it too much in making Lydian music synonymous simply with sensual music. In *The Republic* Plato condemned Lydian music first because it was elegiac and expressed moods of sadness and despair unbecoming in men devoted to the defence of their country. He condemned it only secondarily because it seduced to sensuality.[6] "Because these modes (Mixolydian and Lydian) expressed sad and dissolute emotions respectively," said Plutarch,[7] "Plato did well to reject them and to choose the Dorian mode as the only one convenient for warlike and temperate men." The Lydian mode had been much employed in tragedy and in excluding it Plato forbade music to express tragedy. For the Platonist all music had to be martial or else religious or didactic.

"Of the harmonies," said Socrates, "I know nothing, but I want to have one warlike, which will sound the note which a brave man utters in the hour of danger or stern resolve; . . . and another to

[4] *Laches*, 188 d.

[5] *Of Education, Areopagitica, The Commonwealth*, edited by Laura E. Lockwood, Boston, 1911, p. 9.

[6] *The Dialogues of Plato translated into English by B. Jowett*, Vol. III, pages 273-274.

[7] *De Musica*, Cap. 17.

be used in times of peace and freedom of action, when there is no pressure of necessity and he is seeking to persuade God by prayer, or man by instruction and advice; or on the other hand which expresses his willingness to listen to persuasion or advice and which represents him when he has accomplished his aim, not carried away by success, but acting moderately and wisely and acquiescing in the event. These two harmonies I ask you to leave; . . . the strain of courage and the strain of temperance; these I say leave." [8]

It is not hard to understand why Milton, the young enthusiast over

> Thebes and Pelops' line
> And the tale of Troy divine,

should have baulked at a theory of music which forbade expression, to take a presumable example, of the despair of Orestes, or of Lear.

But Milton stood very much alone among his contemporaries in interpreting the Greek ideal of temperance or the well-poised life (sophrosyne) in a way to leave the tragic sense unhampered. Spenser's treatment of Temperance in the Second Book of *The Faerie Queene* had made grief and its concomitant anger almost as dangerous enemies of self-control as sensuality. Sir Guyon, the Knight of Temperance, moralizes:

> When raging passion with fierce tyranny
> Robs reason of her dew regalitie,
> And makes it servaunt to her basest part,
> The strong it weakens with infirmitie,
> And with bold furie armes the weakest hart:
> The strong through pleasure soonest falles, the weak
> through smart." [9]

The sage and serious Spenser was a much better Platonist than Milton and in consequence of that fact *The Faerie Queene* lacks the tragic elements that might have raised it to the epic level.

Spenser's allegory of the pleasure through which "the strong soonest falles" is embodied in the stories of Phaedria [10] and of Acrasia's Bower of Bliss.[11] His less familiar allegory of the "smart" through which the weak fall is the story of Amavia,[12]

[8] Plato translated by Jowett, *op. cit.*, p. 274.
[9] *The Faerie Queene*, Book II, Canto 1, stanza 57.
[10] *The Faerie Queene*, Book II, Canto vi.
[11] *Ibid.*, II, xii.
[12] *Ibid.*, II, i.

the too-fond wife who killed herself for grief over her murdered husband. The angry scenes where Pyrochles, Furor and Occasion appear [13] are extensions of this allegory, for under the influence of a tradition ultimately Stoic and wide-spread in both the Middle Ages and in the Renaissance Spenser thought of grief and anger as having their psychological roots in the same "smart." [14] He gave more weight to anger than Socrates did because he lived after anger had been raised for several centuries to the rank of a very popular vice as one of the Seven Deadly Sins.

It is very far from my purpose to suggest that the Second Book of *The Faerie Queene* as a whole was a crystallization of orthodox Platonism. It is just a good illustration showing how strikingly the ethical principle underlying the Socratic prejudice against Lydian airs had gained ground during the Renaissance. Many other instances might be found. Almost every serious book written in England, France and Italy between 1400 and 1600, when Europe was striving so self-consciously to bring in an heroic age, in some degree shared Spenser's inheritance of the Platonic Puritanism succinctly defended by Socrates in the passage already quoted from the Third Book of *The Republic.* The war of Reason against Passion was the universal theme which lasted in various forms until it was dissolved by the reactions of sentimentalism and romanticism late in the eighteenth century.

The most influential champions of the Platonic Puritanism during the Renaissance were educators. They did not, of course, share Plato's doubts about poetry, but they were inclined to think even less liberally than he did about music. They were as certain as was Socrates that contemporary popular music was, as it was put by Sassuolo, who taught music in Mantua in the first quarter of the fifteenth century, "inquinata, impudens, corrupta atque cor-

[13] *Ibid.*, II, iv.

[14] The identification of fear with anger is a familiar dogma of orthodox modern psychology. That there is nothing arbitrary in its application to literary purposes is shown by a remark of Mr. Aldous Huxley in *The Young Archimedes*, p. 311: Mr. Huxley describes an Italian peasant furious with grief because his little boy has been driven to suicide by selfish kindness of his *padrona*. "To be angry is easier than to be sad," he writes, "and less painful. It is comforting to think of revenge. 'Don't talk like that,' I said. 'It's no good. It's stupid. And what would be the point?' He had had those fits before when grief became too painful and he had to escape from it. Anger had been the easiest way of escape."

ruptrix.'[15] On the other hand, they needed the example of Socrates to confirm their faith that music is a necessary part of education. Vergerius, writing at Padua in 1392, acknowledged that

"As to music, the Greeks refused the title of 'Educated' to anyone who could not sing or play. Socrates set an example to the Athenian youth by himself learning to play in his old age; urging the pursuit of music not as a sensuous indulgence, but as an aid to the inner harmony of the soul. In so far as it is taught as a healthy recreation for the moral and spiritual nature, music is a truly liberal art, and, both as regards its theory and its practice, should find a place in education."[16]

Aeneas Sylvius, in the Letter to Ladislas, King of Bohemia, in 1459, asked even less certainly than Vergerius

". . . whether we ought to include Music among the pursuits unsuited to a Prince? The Romans of the later age seem to have deprecated attention to this art in their Emperors. It was, on the other hand, held a marked defect in Themistocles that he could not tune the lyre. The armies of Lacedaemon marched to victory under the inspiration of song, although Lycurgus could not have admitted the practice had it seemed to him unworthy of the sternest manhood. The Hebrew poet-king need be but alluded to, and Cicero is on his side also. So amid some diversity of opinion our judgment inclines to the inclusion of Music, as a subject to be pursued in moderation under instructors only of serious character, who will rigorously disallow all melodies of a sensuous nature. Under these conditions we accept the Pythagorean opinion that Music exerts a soothing and refreshing influence upon the mind."[17]

This Pythagorean opinion of the soothing and refreshing effect of music was a betrayal of the Platonic Philistinism, though Vergerius was half unconscious of the fact and half ashamed of it. As soon as music got a foothold as an accepted recreation it was on the way to reclaim its full character as an art, instead of remaining a mere discipline for boys or for men kept permanently immature by a purely military life. With its limited license only as a cure for tired and neurotic minds music was still a very elementary art, in theory at least, but it was on the high road to

[15] Cesare Guastri, *Intorno alla Vita e all'insegnamento di Vittorino da Feltre*, lettere di Sassolo Pratese volgarizzate. Firenze, 1869, p. 69.

[16] P. P. Vergerius, *De ingenuis moribus*, translated by W. H. Woodward in *Vittorino da Feltre and other Humanist Educators*, Cambridge, 1922.

[17] W. H. Woodward, *ibid.*, p. 239.

become the enthusiastically practiced art that we know it to have been in the home of John Milton, Senior, in Bread Street. The heresy that made music an art had a century of history already behind it among writers on education in England when Milton published his Letter *of Education* to Master Samuel Hartlib. Vives, the Spanish disciple of Erasmus who divided his time between England and the Low Countries and was as well acclimated in England as in Holland, justified music in a general discussion of the recreative value of all the arts in his *De tradendis disciplinis* (1531).[18] Returning to the subject for a fuller discussion, with an Aristotelian echo [19] he defended music again as a recreation by a skilful confusion of that value with the orthodox disciplinary value recognized by the rigorous Platonists.

> "Let the pupil practice pure and good music which, after the Pythagorean mode, sooths, recreates, and restores to itself the wearied mind of the student; then let it lead back to tranquillity and tractability all the wild and fierce parts of the student's nature, as it is related in the ancient world, . . . that rocks were moved and wild beasts allured by it." [20]

Vives' recent translator, Professor Foster Watson, compares him with Francis Bacon as a pioneer in the fields in which he worked.[21] His influence, like Bacon's, was a solvent of traditional taboos and reverences. In *The Tractate on Education* Milton echoed his justification of music on traditional disciplinary grounds and recommended "religious, martial or civil ditties; which, if wise men and prophets be not extremely out, have a great power over dispositions and manners to smooth and make them gentle from rustic harshness and distempered passions." But music as a cure for rustic harshness is a very much more urbane conception than music as a cure for distempered passions, and in Milton's subsequent recommendation of music as "not inexpedient after meat, to assist and cherish nature in her first concoction," [22] the dilettante must have felt that at last the orthodox Platonist among music masters had been put to rout.

[18] *Vide* the translation published by Foster Watson, Cambridge, 1913, p. 40.

[19] *The Politics of Aristotle*, translated by B. Jowett, p. 252.

[20] Foster Watson's translation of Vives, p. 205.

[21] *Op. cit.*, Introduction, pp. xxi, xxxiv, liii, etc.

[22] *Of Education, Areopagitica, The Commonwealth*, by John Milton, edited by Laura E. Lockwood, Boston, 1911, p. 26.

To musically sophisticated moderns this whole question of the ethical bearing of music seems strange because we do not understand what Milton meant when he said that many wise men and prophets were strangely mistaken if music did not have incalculable power to discipline the passions. People who, like Mr. Carl Van Vechten, "know the interchangeable values which Händel gave to secular and sacred tunes" and who can deny that "minor keys are sad and that major keys are always suggestive of joy,"[23] may wonder how it was possible to compose music which you could be sure would either incite to noble deeds or sooth the disorder of the mind. That may be a lost art, but we may be certain that it existed in the Renaissance, at least in Utopia, for Sir Thomas More says so. "All their Musicke" in Utopia, it seems,

". . . bothe that they playe upon instrumentes, and that they singe with mannes voyce dothe so resemble and expresse naturall affections, the sound and tune is so applied and made agreeable to the thinge, that whether it bee a prayer, or els a dytty of gladnes, or patience, of trouble, mournynge, or of anger; the fasshion of the melodye dothe so represente the meaning of the thinge that it doth wonderfullye move, stirre, pearce, and enflame the hearers myndes."[24]

No one in the seventeenth century doubted Aristotle's dictum that characters are affected by music or his proof of it "by the power which the songs of Olympus and of many others exercised; for beyond question they inspired enthusiasm" and "enthusiasm is an emotion of the ethical part of the soul."[25] Aristotle's certainty on this score had been reinforced by every writer on music in the intervening centuries and in Milton's mind it stood on a much surer footing than did the contemporary notions about astronomy or any other branch of science.[26] In holding this view

[23] Carl Van Vechten, *Music and Manners*, New York, 1916, p. 183.

[24] *The Utopia of Sir Thomas More: Ralph Robinson's translation with Roper's Life of More and some of his letters*, edited by George Sampson, London, 1910, pp. 182-3.

[25] *Politics*, translated by Jowett, Book VIII, section 5.

[26] Boethius, for example, repeats Aristotle's idea without acknowledgment in his discussion of the proposition on which he founded the *De Musica*, viz., "Musicam naturaliter nobis esse conjunctam, et mores vel honestare vel evertere." Summing up his argument he concludes, "Quid quod cum aliquis cantilenam libentius auribus atque animo capit, ad illud etiam non sponte convertitur, ut motum quoque aliquam similem aiditae

and at the same time recommending the use for pleasure of the whole gamut of vocal and instrumental music available in his time Milton proved himself a rebel against the ethical theory that had limited ideas about music throughout the entire Renaissance.

There was one more aspect of the Platonic prejudice against Lydian music which Milton definitely did not share. It was the underlying preference for simple and archaic types of melody, the fundamentally reactionary element in Plato's feeling which made him resist the law of development in all of the arts which makes progress consist in ceaseless differentiation into new and more and more complex types. This side of Plato's feeling is veiled in *The Republic,* but Plutarch expressed it frankly enough. Soterichus' exposition of the history of music in the *De Musica* is motivated throughout by the belief that the innovations of recent centuries had ruined the art.

> "Music," he said, "is an invention of the gods and is therefore in all its aspects a respectable art. The ancients in their practice of it, as in their practice of all the arts, watched over its dignity; but the moderns, rejecting all its venerable qualities, have introduced into the theatres in the room of this virile and heavenly art that is so dear to the gods an effeminate and mechanized art." [27]

Soterichus regretted the innovation in recent centuries of more complex instruments and more complex rhythms and harmonies than had been known before the Attic stage reached the peak of its development. Readers of *The Republic* will know that in this Plutarch was expressing Plato's deepest prejudice. Milton's enthusiasm for the "skilful organist plying his grave and fancied descant in lofty fugues," and for "the whole symphony with artful and unimaginable touches adorning and graving the well-studied chords of some choice composer"[28] leaves no doubt that on the score of capacity to appreciate the law of evolution in music and its expression in recent inventions in the art Milton was no Platonist.[29]

cantilenae corpus effingat, et quod omnino aliquod melos auditum sibi memor animus ipse decerpat?" The *De Musica,* Book I, Caput i. Boethii, *Opera omnia,* Paris, 1860, Vol. I, p. 1171.

[27] *De Musica,* Section 15.

[28] *Of Education, Areopagitica, The Commonwealth,* pp. 25-6.

[29] Most English writers on music before Milton were pessimists about the state of the art and like Plato were *admiratores temporis acti.* Roger

On examination Milton's short discussion of music in *The Tractate on Education* proves to have been the protest of a mind aesthetically mature against the moralistic and reactionary elements in the Platonic tradition. In the frankly expressed taste for Lydian airs in *L'Allegro* it is not fantastic to read Milton's claim that music should share the right of poetry to be sensuous and passionate.[30]

MERRITT Y. HUGHES.

University of California.

ALDHELM AND THE SOURCE OF *BEOWULF* 2523

In *Modern Language Notes* for February, 1924, I pointed out the correspondence between the *fluenta cruenta* of Aldhelm's *De Virg.* 2420 and the *flōd blōde wēol* of *Beow.* 1422, and from this drew the inference that the author of *Beowulf* was acquainted with Aldhelm's poem. This line[1] of Aldhelm occurs in the account of the martyr Victoria, the striking fact in whose legendary career was her defeat of a dragon whose poisonous breath had infected the Italian city of Tribula, and led its inhabitants to seek deliverance from their peril in flight. Upon their promise to abjure heathen-

Ascham in *Toxophilus* makes Nymphodorus talk as follows: "Therefore eyther Aristotle and Plato knowe not what was good and euyll for learninge and vertue, and the example of wyse histories be vainlie set afore vs or els the minstrelsie of lutes, pipes, harpes, and all other that standeth by suche nice, fine, minikin fingering (suche as the mooste parte of scholers whom I knowe vse, if they vse any) is farre more fitte for the womannishnesse of it to dwelle in the courte among ladies than for any great thing in it whiche shoulde helpe good and sad studie, to abide in the vniuersitie amonges scholers. But perhaps you knowe some great goodnesse of such musicke and such instrumentes, where vnto Plato & Aristotle his brayne coulde neuer attayne, and therfore I will saye no more agaynst it." *The English Works of Roger Ascham* edited by William Aldis Wright, Cambridge, 1904, p. 14.

[30] Although this article puts Milton's attitude toward music against a background in the history of ideas about the art very different from that chosen to illustrate it by Mr. Sigmund G. Spaeth in *Milton's Knowledge of Music* (Princeton, The University Library, 1913), it would not be understood as differing from his conclusion (p. 67) that the prevailing current in Milton's musical tastes was Doric rather than Lydian.

[1] Which see in the passage quoted below, next to the last line.

ism, Victoria betakes herself to the dragon's cave, and bids him depart into the desert, far from the habitations of men; this, since her command is seconded by angelic power, he does with all speed. The cave being thus cleared of its pestiferous occupant, Victoria directs the citizens to convert it into a chapel. Afterward, on her refusing to pay homage to a statue of Diana, she is slain with the sword. The poetic passage is as follows (2385-2411, 2416-21; *draco* and its synonyms in italics):

> Interea Romam linquens Victoria virgo,
> Exul in exilium Tribulanæ ducitur urbis,
> Quo *draco* funestus ructabat flamina ventris,
> Limpida letiferis corrumpens æra venenis [3]
> In tantum ut cives, vasto crepitante tumultu,
> Linquere jam mallent pollutam flatibus urbem,
> Exosi latebram, qua horrens *belva* latebat.
> His igitur miseris spondet Victoria virgo,
> Credula si Domino pandant præcordia Christo,
> Lurida pestifero linquentes idola cultu,
> Ut dicto citius truculentam flamine *gypsam*,
> Quæ turmas vulgi multabat strage cruenta,
> Pelleret e populo, dum mallent credere Christo.
> Quod dum sponderent concordi voce catervæ,
> Ilico squamigerum proturbat virgo *celydrum*,
> Et procul in vacuas jussit reptare salebras;
> Mox *draco* crudelis, sermonum pondere pressus,
> Deserit obscurum squamose pelle tigillum.
> Sic virgo felix, æthrali freta triumpho,
> Ingentem explodit sancta virtute *colubrum*,
> Ut numquam ulterius *serpens* irrumperet antrum.
> Sed procul abscedens incultis exulat arvis;
> Jusserat ut *gypsam* verbo terrente migrare,
> Civibus impendens expulso *natrice* palmam,
> Tunc rogitat cives felix bernacula Christi,
> Quatenus in cripta sibi, *natrix* unde nefandus
> Aufugit, pariter dignentur condere cellam. . . .
> Tunc procus Eugenius, dilubri flamine fretus,
> Turificare jubet munusque litare Dianæ,
> Alma sed imperium sprevit complere nefandum.
> Idcirco macheram stricto mucrone vibrabat
> Crudelis tortor, fundendo fluenta cruenta,
> Virgineos artus consecrans sanguine rubro.

---

[3] Cf. Ovid, *Met.* 3. 49:

Hos necat adflati funesta (*al.* afflatos funesti) tabe veneni.

To this corresponds the earlier prose (308. 21-309. 16):

"Ducta est itaque beata Victoria, præsago vocabulo vere Christi victoria, in Tribulano territorio, ut ibidem exiliata famis copia et cibi inopia angeretur. Ea tempestate contigit ut universi municipes, quorum municipatus in Tribulano municipio fuerat, virus et flatus squamosi *draconis* non ferentes, spreto oppido vagabundis meatibus passim dispergentur. Quibus sancta Victoria, si converterentur ad Deum, relictis deorum statunculis, et abdicatis dilubrorum Lupercalibus, ultronea spopondit se virulenta spumantis *basilisci* spiracula procul pulsuram, et urbem incolumitati reddituram. Nam propter venenata horrentis *chelidri* flabra calamitosum vulgus ingenti strage catervatim trucidabatur, parentes præpostero ordine immatura pignorum funera cernentes, flebilibus orbitatis questibus acriter artabantur. Tunc patronus[3] civitatis

[3] Aldhelm's account becomes clearer in the light of what must have been a previous form of the legend, preserved in an early thirteenth-century manuscript at Namur, published (1883) in the *Analecta Bollandiana* 2. 157-160. An extract from this is as follows:

"Præparatus enim erat in civitate Tribulana draco pessimus, cujus flatu moriebantur homines et jumenta. Fiebat luctus ingens et intolerabilis, ita ut universi relinquerent civitatem suam.

"Contigit autem ut Domicianus, qui erat dominus civitatis, ibidem veniret ubi erat sancta Victoria in exilio, misericordiæ causa. Pervenit itaque ad eam, et cœpit offerre ei panes nitidos et vinum. Cui sancta Victoria dixit: 'Habeo gratias Domino nostro Jesu Christo, qui me saginat omni die. Tu autem ut quid ista sollicitudine veneris, intima.' Respondit Domicianus et dixit: 'Fugi civitatem meam, et mansi in vicino civitatis in casellula mea, quia flatus draconis evadere non poteram. Dixi in corde meo quia, si trans montem mansero, evadam noxios draconis flatus.' Dicit ei sancta Victoria: 'Vos, relictis idolis, si Christum coleritis, statim hic draco fugeret a vobis, et nulla vos fatigaret necessitas.' Dicit ei Domicianus: 'Major et honoratior me nullus est in Tribulana urbe. Si inde illum draconem eliminas, omnes ejus cives faciam fieri Christianos.' Tunc sancta Victoria dixit ei: 'Post crastinum diem illuc veniam ad pullorum cantum, et in nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi faciam illum fugere a finibus vestris.' Tunc Domicianus, vadens in civitatem Tribulanam, dixit civibus sui somnia quæ dixerat ei sancta Victoria. Quo audito, omnes qui a civitate fugerant advenerunt, sanctæ Victoriæ expectantes adventum.

"Sancta autem Victoria sexta feria qua promiserat erat jejunans, sequentique sabbato dominica illucescente perrexit in orationem. Continuo autem oranti ei et petenti comes factus est angelus Domini qui ei visus fuerat, et cœpit in itinere dux ejus esse, dicens ei: 'Nullus horum potest me videre quod ego tecum sum. Esto igitur secura, quoniam quando me non ostendo sibi, non te desero, et quæ jusseris draconi, ego fieri com-

generaliter ex persona promiscui sexus cunctos puellæ oraculis credula præcordia pandere pollicetur, si truculenta gypsæ crudelitas, quæ letiferum miserandis civibus luem inferebat, longius arceretur. Tum sacra virgo, angeli fulta suffragio, cum turbis populosæ civitatis ad spectaculum manipulatim confluentibus, ducitur ad *draconis* speleum, concrepante jam pullorum plausu et sonante gallicinio,[4] et nequaquam formidosis gestibus tremibunda, nec meticulosis palloribus nutabunda, latitantem alloquitur bestiam, 'In nomine,' inquit, 'Jesu Christi Domini nostri, exi hinc, *draco* nequissime, et da honorem Deo. Vade ubi non habitent homines!' Paruit *draco* dictis, et cursu rapidissimo fugiens abscessit; illa vero, ingressa latibum beluæ, flagitat populum, jam periculi expertem, ut sibi oratorium in eadem cripta struant."

The monster of Aldhelm's story slays by means of his poisonous breath, while that with which Beowulf has his fateful encounter devastates the countryside (2312-5, 2321-2) by the flame which issues from his mouth (2312, 2545-9, 2556-8, 2881-2), even Beowulf's home being swallowed up by waves of fire (2324-7; cf. 2333-5). Fearing that a wooden shield would be scant protection against the dragon's blazing breath—as indeed it proved in the case of Wiglaf (2672 ff.)—Beowulf provides himself with one made wholly of iron (2337 ff.), but even so finds it a feeble defense against the overpowering heat (2570-2, 2594-5, 2604-5). However, it is not by flame that Beowulf is destined to die, but by the dragon's venomous bite (2691 ff., 2711-5). Why the poet con-

pello. Confortata autem sancta Victoria ab angelo, civitatem post pullorum cantu ingreditur; et occurrit ei Domicianus cum universis civibus, et intrantem secutus est populus. Et perveniens ad speluncam draconis, clara voce exclamavit sancta Victoria, dicens: 'In nomine,' etc. . . . Tunc draco cursu rapidissimo exiit fugiens, ita ut putares cum flagellis cæsum."

[4] This was at cockcrow of a Sunday morning (see note 3). One is reminded of Prudentius, *Cath.* 1. 37-44:

> Ferunt vagantes dæmonas,
> Lætos tenebris noctium,
> Gallo canente exterritos
> Sparsim timere et cedere.
>
> Invisa nam vicinitas
> Lucis, salutis, numinis,
> Rupto tenebrarum situ
> Noctis fugat satellites.

See also *Haml.* 1. 1. 149-164.

ferred upon the monster this supplementary means of destruction is easy to conjecture: it was only by a death comparatively slow that Beowulf would be enabled to hold discourse with his followers (2724-51, 2794-2816) after his final contest. In one passage the author, just as Beowulf is about to advance upon his foe, superadds the venomous breath of the reptile to the fire which he typically emits (2522-3):

> ac ic ðǣr heaðufȳres hātes wēne,
> [o]reðes ond *attres*.

The "breath and venom" of 2523 must, I take it, be regarded as a hendiadys, and signify "venomous breath."[5] Such a phrase occurs in the earlier part of the above quotation from Aldhelm's prose: *virus et flatus* (*squamosi draconis*). Here we have "venom and breath," instead of "breath and venom"; but here, as in *Beowulf*, there is a hendiadys of words which individually have the identical meaning in the two languages; and that the Latin phrase is a true hendiadys appears from Aldhelm's employment in the next sentence of *virulenta spumantis basilisci spiracula*, and, in the following one, of *venenata horrentis chelidri flabra*, clearly with an equivalent sense. Have we not here, then, another example of a borrowing from Aldhelm by the author of *Beowulf*—a borrowing from the legend of the same martyr as before, only this time from the prose, instead of from the verse?

A feature of both the Latin and the Old English story is synonymical redundancy in the mention of the dragon, the Old English having, besides the obvious designations, *draca* and *wyrm*, something like thirty[6] epithets or kennings. Thus there are four compounds with *draca* (*eorð-*, *fȳr-*, *lēg-*(*līg-*), *nīðdraca*); *gæst-* (*gǣst-?*), and two compounds (*inwit-*, *nīðgæst*, besides *gryregiest*); one compound with *boga* (*hringboga*); four compounds with *-floga* (*gūð-*, *lyft-*, *ūht-*, *wīdfloga*); five compounds with *sceaða* (*attor-*, *gūð-*, *mān-*, *ðēod-*, *ūhtsceaða*); *weard*, besides *beorges weard*, and two compounds (*gold-*, *hordweard*); one compound with *freca*

[5] Cf. 2839: þæt hē wið attorsceaðan oreðe gerǣsde. For numerous examples of hendiadys, see Schmidt, *Shakespeare-Lexicon*, s. v. *And*.

[6] Instead of which, Bode (*Die Kenningar in der Angelsächsischen Dichtung*, 1886, pp. 77-8) reckons only twelve (of which one, *fyrena hyrde*, does not belong here): *inwitgæst*, *gryregiest*; *lyft-*, *gūðfloga*; *attor-*, *mān-*, *ðēod-*, *ūhtsceaða*; *āglǣca*, *bona*, *lāða*.

(*gūðfreca*); then *āglǣca, bona, fēond* (2706), the phrase *beorges hyrde,* and the following adjectives, some of which may perhaps be considered doubtful: *byrnende* (2569), *lāða* (2305), *gryrefāg* (2576), *nearofāh* (2317), and *stearcheort* (2288).

Over against these, the Latin story in verse has seven synonyms—*draco, gypsa* (for *dipsas*), *natrix, belva, celydrus, coluber, serpens*—of which the first three are used twice each, and the rest only once; the account in prose has six, of which the first is employed three times: *draco, gypsa, belua, chelidrus, bestia, basiliscus.*[7] Of these nine different words, four are used in both the verse and the prose: *draco, belua* (*belva*), *gypsa, celydrus* (*chelidrus*).

It is obvious that the kennings make, of the two, the more powerful appeal to the imagination, through suggesting appearance (*gryrefāg, hringboga*), physical activities in space or time (*lyftfloga, ūhtfloga*), function or office (*hordweard*), moral traits (*bona, nīðdraca, nearofāh*), etc., while the Latin merely presents a variety of appellatives for the same object, or—as in this case—for objects of the same class. But of course Latin has its own means of appealing to the imagination: the notion of *hringboga,* for example, is quite as vividly conveyed by Ovid's line (*Met.* 15. 721),

> Perque sinus crebros et magna volumina labens,[8]

of which Old English might, at need, for anything we can see, have rendered either *sinus* or *volumina* by *hringas*[9] or *bogan* (cf. *wyrm wōhbogen, Beow.* 2827). However, it happens that Aldhelm, in the passages quoted for our present purpose, has nothing so pictorially conceived as the Ovidian line; but the copious employment of kennings is suggested by the quick succession of *virulenta spumantis basilisci spiracula* and *venenata horrentis chelidri flabra* in the prose extract.

ALBERT STANBURROUGH COOK.

Yale University.

[7] It may be observed that elsewhere Aldhelm has, in all, three other equivalents: *regulus* (1), *vipera* (3), *aspis* (4).

[8] Cf. Virgil, *Aen.* 5. 85:

> Septem ingens gyros, septena volumina traxit.

[9] Cf. Shelley, *Revolt of Islam* 1. 12. 3-4:

> Sometimes the Snake around his enemy's neck
> Locked in stiff *rings* his adamantine coil.

GOETHE, MADAME DE STAËL AND *WELTLITERATUR*

In Madame de Staël's *De l'Allemagne*[1] appears the following significant and frequently quoted passage (p. 161 f.): "Les nations doivent se servir de guide les unes aux autres, et toutes auraient tort de se priver des lumières qu'elles peuvent mutuellement se prêter. Il y a quelque chose de très-singulier dans la différence d'un peuple à un autre: le climat, l'aspect de la nature, la langue, le gouvernement, enfin surtout les événements de l'histoire, puissance plus extraordinaire encore que toutes les autres, contribuent a ces diversités, et nul homme, quelque supérieur qu'il soit, ne peut deviner ce qui se développe naturellement dans l'esprit de celui qui vit sur un autre sol, et respire un autre air: on se trouvera donc bien en tout pays d'accueillir les pensées étrangères; car, dans ce genre, l'hospitalité fait la fortune de celui qui reçoit." The spirit of this and of other statements in *De l'Allemagne* (1810) bears close enough resemblance to Goethe's ideas on *Weltliteratur* to warrant a comparison. These ideas were formulated by Goethe[2] in the late twenties of the nineteenth century.

Any attempt at such comparison necessitates an explanation of the much debated term *Weltliteratur*. For in spite of his repeated use of the word, Goethe did not explicitly define it. To him *Weltliteratur* signified a stage in the development of national literatures in which they exert a manifest influence upon each other, both in form and in content. In such international literary activity he was profoundly concerned with those broader interests and ideas which were developing side by side in various countries and which seemed to be pointing toward a common intellectual and spiritual life among nations, toward great humanitarian ideals which might ultimately transcend national differences. Goethe was of the opinion that receptivity to the thoughts of other nations must result in mutual advantage and understanding; in this literary interchange he was greatly interested in the part which German literature seemed destined to play.

Madame de Staël and Goethe both recognize that to remain

[1] References are to pages of the Didot edition of Madame de Staël's complete works. Paris, 1871. Vol. 2.

[2] References are to volume and page of the *Jubiläums-Ausgabe* of Goethe's complete works; Stuttgart and Berlin, Cotta.

vigorous and youthful, a national literature must be stimulated and must have its energy renewed from vital sources. If these are not to be found within the nation's borders, other sources of beauty must be welcomed even though they be of foreign origin. Any new great work of art is to be scrutinized without national prejudice; every nation must be receptive to new ideas and intent upon adapting them to its own individuality. Madame de Staël and Goethe are both aware that literary glory can be achieved along diverse routes and that no one nation has a monopoly of all that is true, good and beautiful. In intellectual free trade one literature may consequently serve as a stimulus to another.

As early as 1802, in a preface to *Delphine* (I, 336), Madame de Staël had asserted that French literature was threatened with sterility, lack of spontaneity and monotony. She had declared that new inspiration could not come from a study of French works, but must come from the writings of some other nation whose point of view and whose emotional nature differ essentially from the French. She was of the opinion that national prejudices, which might prevent the French from studying others, would prove a great obstacle to future success. In *De l'Allemagne* Madame de Staël writes in much the same vein; here (p. 4) she maintains that the sterility, which threatens French literature, leads to the conclusion that French "esprit" is in need of being renewed by a more vigorous sap. The source of real beauty must be rediscovered. And, since foreign opinions—whether just or unjust—stimulate thought, it would be unwise to erect a Chinese wall about literary France in order to prevent ideas from coming in. Similarly, Goethe enjoins open-minded receptivity, and is fully aware that hospitality to foreign literary influences has been profitable to Germany in the past. He points out (37, 5) that, since no modern nation can claim absolute originality, the Germans need not be ashamed of having been forced by circumstances into acquiring poetic form and content from others. Yet he asserts that foreign borrowings have been so thoroughly suffused with the German spirit as to become essentially German property. He dwells upon another asset as well, namely upon the advantage derived from foreign interest in a nation's literature. For without such interest, says he (38, 137), any literature finally becomes bored with itself. Just as Madame de Staël states that the opinions of other nations force a nation to think, so Goethe (38, 171) sees a gain accruing to the Germans

from a study of critical discussions of German literature in British reviews. Such criticism, he maintains, will compel the Germans to concern themselves anew with their literature and to regard it in a new light. Deeply concerned as he was with all manifestations of foreign interest in German literature, Goethe remarked (38, 97) that all nations were observing Germany, were praising and criticising, accepting and rejecting, imitating and misrepresenting, understanding or misunderstanding, opening or closing their hearts to the Germans. He advised that all this be viewed with equanimity because of its great value to Germany.

Madame de Staël discusses the peculiar individuality underlying nationalities. In a passage already quoted (p. 161 f.), she enumerates forces which give rise to differentiation and which serve as obstacles to international understanding. She believes that such factors as climate, nature, language, government, and historical tradition make for diversity in peoples. Diversities thus produced are so profound as to make it practically impossible for a representative of one nation to comprehend directly the natural reactions of another. Furthermore, Madame de Staël stresses differences in social environment. Minds, says she (p. 45 f.), which are developed in solitude and in contemplation of abstract ideas, are not like those trained by social contacts and by a life of practical activity. It is thus that she accounts for differences reflected in the literature, in the arts, in the philosophy and in the religion of the Germans and the French. She regards these peoples as strangers to each other, separated by the Rhine as an eternal barrier. Goethe, too, points out diversities which render it difficult for one nation to understand another. According to him (38, 204 f.) each nation is differentiated from others by certain characteristics; these serve to separate, attract and repel. The outward manifestations of these inward characteristics usually seem strikingly disagreeable or at best ridiculous to others. This is way we usually respect a nation less than it deserves. On the other hand, he feels that the inward qualities of a nation are known or recognized neither by its own representatives nor by foreigners. Yet as in the case of the individual, the inmost qualities of a whole nation unconsciously produce their effect, and in the end we are filled with wonder at their manifestations. Consequently the whole literature of a nation can neither be comprehended nor profoundly appreciated unless one is mindful of it in all its complexity. Ma-

dame de Staël strives to determine the bases for national differences, as manifest in literature, and stresses them as so many barriers to appreciative understanding. She affirms that the glory and even the charm of every country invariably reside in national character and in national spirit (p. 20). On the other hand, though cognizant of national differences, Goethe feels that national peculiarities are to be accepted as such; indeed, they are to be capitalized as a basis for intercourse. For he regards the peculiar characteristics of a nation as akin to its language and to its coinage, in that they make intercourse possible and facilitate it (38, 141).

Although in his writings on *Weltliteratur* Goethe has little to say about imitation, he does state emphatically (38, 170) that nations are by no means to think alike. Furthermore, as has been seen, Goethe implies that Germany's foreign literary borrowings have not led to idle imitation, but that national individuality has invested new ideas with its own distinctive quality (37, 5). Madame de Staël is most insistent in her demand that one nation shall not imitate another. She asserts that imitation of the French by the Germans could only harm the latter, since their superiority lies in their independence of mind, in their love of solitude and in individual originality (p. 25). According to her opinion each country has its national taste and natural grace. Although another literature may not conform to French canons of good taste it may nevertheless contain new ideas which may prove a source of enrichment if modified to suit the French manner (p. 4). Madame de Staël believes that the French may profit (p. 45) by acquiring some of the serious, contemplative, religious spirit of the Germans, and that the latter need acquaintance with the social graces and the sprightliness of the French. Yet she regards mere imitation of foreigners as a lack of patriotism (p. 21).

It is but natural that Goethe should place a stronger emphasis upon international literary relations as a source of international conciliation than does Madame de Staël in her *De l'Allemagne*. For the latter work appeared during the period of Napoleonic oppression, whereas Goethe's views on *Weltliteratur* were developed later during a more peaceful period. Madame de Staël remarks (p. 45) that German and French writers have been unjust toward each other, in part through ignorance of each other's writings. Breadth of knowledge, says she, will make for tolerance. She

asserts that the men of genius of all countries are intended to understand and to esteem each other. Moreover, she contends that in spite of barriers there is a supernational element in literature which unites rather than separates peoples. This is the realm of ideas; for ideas, says she (p. 21), belong to all nations. Goethe stresses the importance of taking cognizance of other peoples, and states that it is becoming most necessary for every alert individual to determine his relation to his own and to other peoples (38, 40). He notes (38, 74) that nations are removing barriers and striving to approach each other; they are inclined to develop a community of interests and of habits, and even similar literatures. As a result of this tendency, he feels that nations will abandon the inclination to scoff at each other; they will regard one another from a higher point of view and will resolve to rise out of the narrow circle in which they have been revolving so long. On one occasion (38, 170) Goethe enjoins merely that nations take notice of each other, understand one another, and at least learn mutual tolerance. On another occasion (38, 141) he goes so far as to believe that international good-will may result from the efforts of authors and poets to appreciate and emphasize the universally human. In practical life he sees a tendency to mitigate the general coarseness, cruelty, falsehood, selfishness and deception which have prevailed. Although he does not presume that this tendency will result in world peace, he does hope that inevitable strife will gradually become less bitter, that war will become less cruel and the victor less insolent. Goethe regards it as the duty of nations, therefore, to adopt anything in each other's literatures that points toward such international good-will. Genuine universal tolerance, says he, can best be realized by accepting the specific individuality or peculiarity of nations, and by holding to the conviction that what is truly meritorious belongs to all mankind.

In conclusion, it is of interest to note the close correspondence between M. Lanson's characterization of Madame de Staël's views on international literary relations and Goethe's conception of *Weltliteratur*. For, in commenting upon *De l'Allemagne,* M. Lanson says:[8] "Le rêve de Mme. de Staël, c'est une littérature européene, un concert où chaque nation apporterait sa note originale,

[8] *Histoire de la Littérature Française.* 13 e. Paris, Hachette, 1916, p. 885.

un commerce aussi où chaque nation s'enrichirait de ce qu'elle ne saurait produire." Yet in spite of such general similarity in the viewpoint of Madame de Staël and of Goethe, the former remained convinced of the fundamental superiority of French taste and style, and the latter firmly believed that, as a result of previous foreign literary borrowings, Germany was in a position to play the honored role of giver.

JOHN C. BLANKENAGEL.

Ohio Wesleyan University.

AN EARLY POEM OF ANNA LOUISE KARSCHIN

Anna Louise Karschin (1722-1791) the German Sappho, as she was later called by admiring contemporaries, spent the first half of her life in obscure and humble surroundings. Her earliest poetic attempts were printed either as broadsides or in provincial newspapers, and have therefore been preserved only in part. The first entry in Goedeke's *Grundriss* is dated 1758:

1) Die gedemüthigten Russen. (Triumphlied auf den Sieg bey Leuthen. 5. Dez. 1757). Glogau, 1758.

The well-known fact that the Battle of Leuthen, Dec. 5, 1757, was a victory, not over the Russians, but over the Austrians under Prince Charles of Lorraine, is a sufficient indication that Goedeke's title, perpetuated in the recent third edition, is based on mere hear-say evidence. Nevertheless, Anna Louise Karschin did write a poem on the Battle of Leuthen.[1] It is printed as a quarto sheet of 8 unnumbered pages, of which the second and last are blank:

Freudige Empfindungen redlicher Herzen, | die, | wegen des verliehenen | herrlichen Sieges | dem Höchsten Dank opferten, | welchen | Se. Königl. Majest. von Preussen | den 5ten December 1757. | bey Fröbelwitz, zwischen Neumarck und Lissa | über die Oesterreichische grosse Armee | erfochten haben. | Beschrieben |

[1] The fact that she names the battle, not after Leuthen, but from the neighboring villages of Frobelwitz and Lissa, is of no moment, especially as the exact date is given. A plan of the battle-field, with the location of all the places mentioned, may be seen in Meyers *Konversationslexikon*, 6. Aufl. Bd. 12, S. 482.

von | Anna Louise Karschin, geb. Dürbachin, | eines Schneiders Frau aus Glogau. | Glogau, 1757.

Entscheitelt wird das feindliche Vergnügen,
Der Stolz wird schüchtern und verschwiegen,
Die kühn gewordne Hofnung stirbt.
Sie fliehn zertheilt die fürchterlichen Heere,
5 Der Sieg heischt unsre Freudenzähre,
Die um des Himmels Beyfall wirbt.
Schon sah mit blickenden Gedancken
Der Wiener Thron an seinem Fuß
Elisien zum Schwure wanken;
10 Schon lies man sie zum Händekuß,
Die Städte durch das Schwerdt bezwungen,
Und jauchzte von Eroberungen.

Das Schröcken kam und änderte die Scene,
Der Ruf schry in die Jubelthöne
15 Und sagte Friedrichs Daseyn an.
Nun staunten sie die prahlerischen Sieger,
So staunt der Löwe, der den Tieger
Im Grimme nicht zerreissen kann.
Doch aufgebläht durch ihre Stärke,
20 Verwegen durch die Sicherheit,
Verliessen sie die festen Werke
Und wagten einen Schritt zum Streit,
Und wusten nicht, daß ihrem Schritte
Die Vorsicht selbst entgegen stritte.

25 In unabsehlich ausgedähnter Weite,
Erfüllt mit Hunger nach der Beute,
So zeigten sie dem Auge sich.
Die Erde bebte unter ihren Rossen,
Sie schnaubten, da sie Blut vergossen,
30 Und raßten, da ihr Muth verblich.
Bekannt mit Friedrichs seiner Rechte
Erzitterten sie, da Er schlug,
Da sie in schwarze Mitternächte
Der Arm des Todesengels trug.
35 So weiß der Größte aller Grossen
Den Uebermuth vom Stuhl zu stossen.

So schlug Jehov mit seines Knechtes Schwerdte
Das Schwerdt, das unser Blut begehrte,
So hat sein Grimm das Volck zertheilt,
40 Das in der Flucht wie des Egyptens Heere
Die Rache sieht, die gleich dem Meere
Sich über sie zu stürzen eilt.
Die Furcht entflieht von unsrer Wange,
Die Freude glüht in unserm Blick,
45 Und vor dem lauten Lobgesange
Schämt sich die Schüchternheit zurück,
Die Untreu hängt den Kopf und kennet
Das Glück nicht, das der Fromme nennet.

Die Feinde fliehn und wünschen sich erschrocken
50 Auf Berge, wo mit weissen Locken
Der Winter sich verbreitend sitzt.
Verfolgt vom Held und naß von rothen Strömen
Wünscht ihre Angst den Weg nach Böhmen,
Von schwacher Hoffnung unterstützt
55 Enteilen sie dem Ueberwinder
Hin, wo sie die Canone deckt,
Da werden der Verzweiflung Kinder
Die schwarzen Ahndungen erweckt;
Die fürchten, daß auch unterm Walle
60 Der Tod sie würgend überfalle.

So weiß der HErr die Macht im Staub zu schelten,
Die der Zerstöhrer kleiner Welten
Und Gott auf Erden wollte seyn,
Die seinem Rath beherzt entgegen scholte
65 Und Könige entgrössern wolte,
Diß Recht geziemet ihm allein,
Ihm dem erhabensten Regierer,
Dem Erd und Meer, den Scepter küßt;
Er sah des kleinen Heeres Führer,
70 Den Held, der unsre Hoffnung ist,
Da hörten ihn die Himmel sagen:
Mein Schröcken soll die Feinde schlagen.

Das Schrecken greift nach den verschwornen Mächten,
Die Friedrichs grossen Muth nicht schwächten,
75 Ihr kriegrischer Entwurf zerfährt.
So schmelzt der Schnee, wenn nah am jungen Lenze
Aus jener fernen Länder Gränze
Die Wärme wieder zu uns kehrt.
Paris empfindet noch die Beule,
80 Die Ihm der Arm des Helden schlug,
Der unsichtbare Donner-Keile
In den gerechten Waffen trug:
Die Fürsten flohen vor dem Grösten,
Er ging Sein traurig Volck zu trösten.

85 Er kam und fand Elisien beschwemmet
Vom Strome, der zu schwach verdämmet,
Verschantzte Städte mit sich riß.
Europa hörts, daß diese stolze Wogen
Verkleinert sich zurücke zogen,
90 So bald Sie Friedrich weichen hieß.
Sein Glanz drängt in die Königreiche
Verehrung vor den Helden ein.
O Land! vergiß des Schröckens Streiche,
Und laß die Freude würcksam sein;
95 Doch frag dein Herz, wenn du dich freuest,
Ob du des Friedrichs würdig seyest.

The poem is here reprinted in the exact spelling of the original, aside from l. 29, where the misprint *vrrgossen* has been corrected. The involved construction of the first sentence of the title is worthy of note. *Elisien* for *Schlesien* (ll. 9, 85) is unusual, I am unable to cite other instances. *In schwarze Mitternächte* (l. 33) is paralleled by Gleims *in schwarzer Mitternacht,* cited *DWB.* VI, 2419, but the plural *Oft in tiefen Mitternächten* there ascribed to Goethe does not belong here, as Goethe wrote *Winternächten:* the form *Mitternächten* was introduced by the reprint A[2] of the edition of 1806. *Entgrössern* (l. 65) seems to be a coinage of the poetess. The biblical flavor pervading the poem hardly needs comment: line 36, for example, is a paraphrase of *Luke* I, 52.

W. KURRELMEYER.

THE *CANON'S YEOMAN'S TALE*

The *Canon's Yeoman's Tale* has received rather less attention from the investigators than most of the *Canterbury Tales*—perhaps because there is no recognized source for it; and yet it presents one or two interesting problems. For example, the relation of Pars Secunda to Pars Prima and to the *Yeoman's Prologue* is not entirely clear. Pars Prima is "not really a tale at all, but a description of alchemy and its professors" (Skeat); it is, in truth, a kind of additional prologue of two hundred and fifty lines. And the real tale (consisting of little more than five hundred lines) has itself an introduction (ll. 972-1021) and a conclusion (ll. 1388-1481). Apart from this peculiarity of structure, moreover, there are certain difficulties which have apparently never been explained.

Pars Secunda begins—

> Ther is a chanoun of religioun
> Amonges us. . . .

Who are meant? There is no Canon among the Pilgrims of the General Prologue, and the Yeoman's Canon has fled away (l. 702) nearly three hundred lines before. Who, again, are the "worshipful chanouns religious" of l. 992, whom the narrator is anxious not to offend, but for whom partly the tale is told (l. 1000)? What do we know of their convent (l. 1007)? Again, is it likely that the Yeoman, who in his Prologue and in Pars Prima is so excited, so vivacious in his simple way, should underneath have a sober didactic purpose?

> But to correcten that is mis I mente.

Perhaps; but certainly the Yeoman would never utter the lines 1342-48—

> Was never brid gladder agayn the day,
> Ne nightingale, in the sesoun of May,
> Nas never noon that luste bet to singe;
> Ne lady lustier in carolinge
> Or for the speke of love and wommanhede,
> Ne knight in armes to doon an hardy dede
> To stonde in grace of his lady dere.

There are, to be sure, other inconsistencies as marked as this in the *Canterbury Tales*, but they have mostly, in various ways, been explained, even the Merchant's elaborate irony; here it is almost incomprehensible, unless on the theory that Chaucer wrote very

carelessly indeed, that he should put this *purpureus pannus* in the Yeoman's mouth. Finally, the high comedy of the epilogue (ll. 1388-1481)—with its bit of high seriousness, also,—and its quotations from Arnoldus and 'Senior' are wholly inconsistent with the impetuous blundering loquacity of the Yeoman elsewhere.

It is difficult, therefore, not to infer that Pars Secunda was composed before the Yeoman was conceived,[1] and then was adapted to the new requirements by a few insertions. These insertions are in fact tolerably recognizable. They are probably ll. 1088-1101, in which the Yeoman deprecates (honestly or not) the thought that the Canon of the story is the canon with whom he overtook the pilgrims; ll. 1172-75, which echo a part of the first insertion;[2] and probably ll. 1480-81 at the end. Furthermore, if Pars Secunda was composed for the *Canterbury Tales,* Chaucer must have intended to introduce a group of canons into the pilgrimage,—or perhaps find them at Canterbury and use them for the return journey. Or it is just possible that when he abandoned the plan of a double set of tales Chaucer invented the Yeoman in order to bring this tale into a different group.—But these are vain imaginations. If, however, Pars Secunda was *not* composed for the *Canterbury Tales,* there is no hint as to why Chaucer should have written up this lively exposé of deceitful alchemists and addressed it to a body of canons, unless it had a foundation in fact or a special application which is unknown to us.[3]

At the same time, one need not infer that if the *Canon's Yeoman's Tale* was not written for the *Tales,* it was therefore written earlier. For the evidences of style and metre certainly, as all have felt, seem to suggest a late date. Chaucer was under no obligation during the last ten years (say) of his life to devote himself to one task exclusively. Moreover, this tale of an alchemist canon is just the sort of *jeu d'esprit* any one might turn out under special

[1] This is, of course, quite a different matter from Chaucer's "change of plan" in introducing a figure not described in the General Prologue. Cf. G. L. Kittredge, in *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature,* 30. 87.

[2] Cf. l. 1172 and l. 1093. Moreover, ll. 1299-1307, or more precisely 1303-07, may be a later insertion also, since l. 1304 echoes l. 1093 and l. 1172.

[3] It must be admitted that the whole question of Chaucer's adaptations of the tales to the speakers and the other inconsistencies of structure in the *Canterbury Tales* requires further study than it has received; but of course most of the maladjustments mean merely that Chaucer had not finished his work.

circumstances or for a special occasion; and it is also just the sort of poem, which, once written, Chaucer would want to adapt for the Canterbury pilgrims. We are only to recognize that the adaptation was incomplete.

Another problem which has been passed over in silence is that of the chemical details of the Canon's experiments; nor is the explanation altogether obvious unless one take for granted a certain amount of technical knowledge on the part of the reader.[4] In the first experiment (ll. 1116 ff.) the Priest puts an ounce of mercury into the crucible, to which the Canon adds, by means of his specially prepared coal, an ounce of silver filings. Then the Canon makes a mould to fit in size and shape a plate of pure silver weighing one ounce (which he conceals in his sleeve); and when the contents of the crucible are poured into the mould and cooled in water, one ounce of silver remains. The second experiment (ll. 1249 ff.) repeats this process, except that the real silver is surreptitiously introduced into the crucible from the end of a hollow stick. That is to say, in both experiments two ounces of material, one of silver and one of mercury, are put into the crucible and only one ounce is taken out, an ounce of silver. But there is no real difficulty; for the melting point of silver is 962° C.,—and from the conditions described this temperature must be assumed to have been reached,—whereas at 357° C. (the boiling point of mercury) the mercury in the crucible would be volatilized, leaving only the silver to be poured into the mould. This is perfectly simple, once it is explained. But one need not suppose that Chaucer calculated the details quite thus, though it is plain, I think, that he knew enough about alchemy to avoid any error. The Canon's third experiment is of an altogether different sort and involves no chemical laws.

PAULL FRANKLIN BAUM.

Duke University.

[4] Skeat seems to have missed the point. For, speaking of alchemical experiments in general, he says: "The frequent introduction of small quantities of gold caused that metal to accumulate; and if, *by any favorable process*, the quicksilver was separated from the mass, a considerable quantity of gold would now and then actually appear" (Oxford *Chaucer*, III, 500; the italics are mine). I have myself asked various Chaucerians and one or two chemists, and received such answer as Plato's disciple received, l. 1457. For the explanation here given I am indebted to Professor M. L. Hamlin.

THE "UNPUBLISHED" POEMS OF MLLE DE SCUDERY AND MLLE DESCARTES

Some bibliographers state [1] that *Ms* 25648 F. F. of the Bibliothèque Nationale contains several unpublished letters in verse and prose of Mlle Madeleine de Scudéry and Mlle Catherine Descartes.[2] The first line of each poem is given by Lachèvre (III, 292 and 537):

Of Mlle Descartes:

1.—Demeure, cher Tircis, demeure auprès de moi . . .
2.—Si mon cœur est (?) sensible et tendre . . .
3.—On ne peut refuser un cœur . . .

Of Mlle de Scudéry:

1.—En m'apprenant, Iris, que vous sçavez rimer . . .
2.—Vous dites fort modestement . . .
3.—Quand je fis de l'amour une image parfaite . . .

These several letters and poems are, however, not unpublished. They have been printed entirely in the Abbé L. Bordelon's forgotten and insignificant compilation *Les Malades de belle Humeur ou Lettres divertissantes écrites de Chaudray,* Paris, 1697, and Lyon, 1698.[3] An incomplete and slightly changed text, lacking two poems and a few verses, occurs in *Essais de Lettres familières sur toutes sortes de Sujets* (Paris, 1690), published by Cassagne and Furetière. This incomplete version has been reproduced by Rathery and Boutron in their *Mademoiselle de Scudéry, sa vie et sa correspondance* (1873, pp. 393-403).[4]

[1] Lachèvre, *Bibliographie des Recueils collectifs*, III, 292 and 537; Lanson, *Manuel Bibl.*, 4330.

[2] The niece of R. Descartes, the philosopher. Cf. *Anthologie des Poètes Bretons du XVIIe siècle*, p. 185; Toinet, *Essai d'une liste alphabétique raisonnée des auteurs . . . de 1600 à 1715*, Fasc. II, p. 12; J. de la Porte, *Hist. litt. des Femmes Fr*, 1769, II, 149. Kerdanet in his *Notices chronologiques . . . de la Bretagne*, 1818, p. 189, mentions a volume of poetry of Mlle Descartes, published in 1693, of which no trace is found in other bibliographies.

[3] The title page adds: On trouvera dans ces Lettres un très grand nombre de bons mots, de Dialogues, d'Epigrammes, de Remarques, de choses difficiles à croire, de coûtumes, et autres traits d'érudition.

[4] These letters are *not* found in *Lettres de Mlle de Scudéry, de Mme de*

To make their truncated text more intelligible I reprint here the missing fragments according to Ms. 25648 of the Bibliothèque Nationale and Bordelon's *Malades de belle Humeur:*

1.—The first letter of Mlle de Scudéry to Mlle Descartes, printed by Rathery and Boutron, refers to a poem of Mlle Descartes, of which two lines are quoted:

> Faut-il avant sa mort que tant de fois je meure;

and,

> Et devant le trépas ne me fais pas mourir.

These lines occur in the poem of Mlle Descartes which precedes the letter in both Ms. 25648 and Bordelon's compilation, so that no doubt can be entertained as to its relation to Mlle de Scudéry's correspondence:

> Demeure, cher Tircis, demeure auprès de moi,
> Viens rassurer un cœur toujours tremblant pour toi,
> Hélas! La moindre absence allarme ma tendresse;
> Je crains l'instant fatal dont la mort doit un jour
> Sans pitié séparer une si tendre amour!
> Au moins, tant que le ciel nous prête sa lumière,
> Autant que tu m' es cher, & que je te suis chère,
> N'incite point la mort qui nous doit désunir,
> Et devant le trépas ne me fais point mourir;
> L'un et l'autre occupé du seul soin de nous plaire,
> Faisons de notre amour notre importante affaire.
> Borne ici tes projets, quel destin plus heureux
> Que d'être aimé toujours et toujours amoureux!
> Pourras-tu supporter cette absence cruelle?
> Est-il gloire à ce prix qui te paroisse belle?
> Je te dis que je t'aime, et tu veux me quitter:
> A-t-on jamais vu Mars sur l'amour l'emporter?
> Que te peuvent offrir et Mars et la Victoire?
> Je t'ai donné mon cœur, te faut-il d'autre gloire?
> Ingrat, te reste-t-il à former des souhaits,
> Quand tu te vois aimé plus qu'on n'aima jamais?
> Veux-tu dans les hasards dont Bellone est suivie,
> En exposant tes jours mettre en péril ma vie?
> Les fers, les feux, les dards ont-ils donc tant d'appas?
> Et me préfères-tu peut être le trépas?

Salvan, de Saliez et de Mlle Descartes, Paris, 1806. The Notice sur Mlle Descartes (p. xl) states: " comme il nous reste que très-peu de choses de Mlle Descartes, nous avons cru devoir placer dans notre collection épistolaire tout ce que nous avons pu rassembler de ses productions."

Dieux! Je meurs quand j'y pense, et j'y pense à toute heure;
Faut-il avant la mort que tant de fois je meure?
Si tu fais tous mes vœux, et moi tous tes désirs,
Est-il ailleurs pour nous de gloire et de plaisirs?
Viens passer avec moi plein d'ardeur et de joie
Des jours par l'Amour même ourdis d'or et de soie.
Tu m'opposes l'honneur et les lois du devoir!
En est-il d'autre, hélas, que m'aimer et me voir?
Qui t'a dit, après tout, que malgré ton absence,
Mon cœur aura toujours une exacte constance?
Si tu veux me quitter, mérites-tu ma foi?
Mais non, va, pars, plutôt que de douter de moi.
Sois sûr de me trouver, infortunée Amante,
Ou morte de douleur, ou fidèle et constante.

2.—In the first letter of Mlle de Scudéry (*Rathery and Boutron,* p. 393) a few verses are lacking. The following must be inserted between line two and three:

Je vois de votre cœur la sensible tendresse,
Et dans vos sentiments tant de délicatesse.
Que l'Amour règne dans vos vers,
Comme il règne dans l'Univers.

Line 14 is followed by:

Il faut de la rigueur ou de l'indifférence
Pour mettre dans son cœur une ombre de constance,
Et je regarde enfin comme un fort grand tourment
D'avoir plus d'amour qu'un Amant.

3.—The second letter of Mlle de Scudéry promises a Madrigal (*Rathery and Boutron,* p. 399) which is not given at the end: "Je prends la liberté Mademoiselle, de vous envoyer un madrigal qui a eu le bonheur de ne pas déplaire au Roi, et je souhaite qu'il soit aussi heureux auprès de vous. . ." This poem did not appear in the Anthologies of the time (Cf. Lachèvre, *op. cit.*) and is not included in the *Choix de Poésies* which forms the *Appendix* of Rathery and Boutron's work, so that it very probably, occurs nowhere else in print than in the *Malades de belle Humeur.*

AU PRINCE ALEXANDRE, Comte de Toulouse, Amiral de France, au sortir de sa petite vérole.

Quand je tremblois pour vous dans ce péril sans gloire,
Le Ciel, Prince charmant, me fit voir votre Histoire:
Comme un jeune Alcion durant vos premiers jours,
Vous voguerez en paix sur les plaines humides,

Vos Tritons seront des Amours,
Et les Grâces vos Nereïdes;
Mais quand d'autres perils viendront jusques à vous,
Devenant de la gloire amoureux et jaloux,
On vous verra braver le courroux de Neptune,
Porter dans votre sang César et sa fortune,
Couvrir toutes les mers de vos faits inouïs,
Et faire dire enfin des Indes à la Grèce:
Rapide Conquerant, mais rempli de sagesse,
Il accorde fort bien Alexandre et Louis.

GUSTAVE L. VAN ROOSBROECK.

New York University.

O. F. *CUITURE*

Raschi uses the Old French word *cuiture* four times as a gloss in his Hebrew Commentary on the Talmud. He employs it in the two senses of 'running sore' and 'pus.' In *Sabbath,* 3, a, in explaining *mefis mursa,* 'one that presses an ulcer,' he renders *mursa,* 'ulcer,' by *cuiture,* and adds: "the *mursa* may be pressed to drain off pus." The same gloss, *cuiture* for *mursa,* is used in the *Mahzor Vitry* (French ritual work of the twelfth century); "and as to *mursa,* which is called *cuiture,* it is permitted to extract pus from it even though there be blood in it." [1] In *Sabbath,* 62, b, Raschi again uses *cuiture* to translate *keba;* in another passage (*ib.* 81, a) Raschi defines *keba* as "a sore discharging foul humor." In *Niddah* 55, b, and *Kerithoth* 13, a, *cuiture* glosses *leḥah seruḥah,* 'pus.' In *Hullin,* 47, b, finally, *cuiture* glosses *mugla,* 'secreted matter,' 'pus.'

Cuiture, which is so familiar to Raschi, is obviously from *coctura. Coctura,* however, does not occur in classical Latin in the specialized sense of 'pus,' 'matter.' *Coquere* in the sense of 'ripening, developing,' *maturare,* is frequent.[2] It is used, like *cozer* in Portuguese, mainly of grains and fruits. *Poma ex arboribus, cruda si sunt, vix evelluntur; si matura et cocta, decidunt.*[3] *Coctura* might be used with a somewhat similar force, as in Pliny, *Hist.*

[1] *Mahzor Vitry* (Nuremberg 1923), p. 131, l. 11.

[2] Cf. *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae,* s. v. *coquere,* 2, b. which cites the various classical Latin texts mentioned below.

[3] *Cic. de Senectute,* 19, 71.

Nat., 14, 55; *ea caeli temperies fulsit quam cocturam vocant,* 'ripening weather.' As *maturare* was applied in medical terminology to ulcers and abscesses, so we find Pliny, *op. cit.* XX, 19, 74, speaking of a juice *ad suppurationes concoquendas.* Celsus similarly uses the word of maturing a tumor, when he speaks of remedies *quae concoquant et moveant pus.*[4]

Coctio, another derivative of the same root, was, according to Cassius Felix, *de Medicina,* ch. XXXVI, the Latin equivalent of the Greek *aptha* (ἄφθη), an ulcer in the mouth.

In Rumanian, *coace* (*coquere*) has exactly the force of *maturare* when applied to tumors and ulcers, and *copturǎ* (*cocturǎ*) means precisely 'pus,' 'matter.' It is also of some interest to note that in Italy *coctura* appears in the Venetian dialect in the related sense of 'heat pimples, blisters.'[5]

There are two entries in the *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum,* ed. G. Goetz, vol. III, 595, 26; 629, 26, one in the *Hermeneumata Codicis Vaticani Reginae Christinae* 1269, Saeculi X, the other in Codex Vat. 4417, Saeculi X/XI, that puzzled Goetz. The first, which is found in a list of plants, minerals and animal substances employed in pharmacy, reads:

sania. i. coctura.

The second occurs in a list of miscellaneous terms and reads:

samam idest cocturam.

That the first has strayed into its place is evident, for neither *sania* nor *coctura* ever occurs anywhere in the nomenclature of the animal, vegetable, or mineral kingdom. Probst's conjecture as to these glosses (*Thes. Ling. Lat., coctura,* 2, b) rests upon a suggestion made by Goetz in the index of the *Corp. gloss. lat., s. v. coctura.* Probst gives as a secondary meaning for *coctura: de re quae coquitur, saepius i. q. coctum,* and adds in parenthesis: *fortasse huc pertinent Gloss.* —— *a; sania* [*' sania i. q. terra Samia? Goetz.*] We should be on safer ground by taking *sania* as a vulgar form of *sanies,*[6] so that *coctura* would have the sense of 'corruption,' 'pus.'

[4] ***De Re Medica***, **V, III.**

[5] **Boerio, *s. v. coture.***

[6] **For conjectures as to the existence of *sania* in Vulgar Latin, cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Rom. etym. Wb.*, § 7577.**

Godefroy does not record Old French *cuiture* in this sense. He lists among its meanings: *brûlure d'une plaie, marque de brûlure, cautère, bouton de feu,* and cites, among others, the following passages as illustrating those significations of the word:

> Il ne se puet aider, tant est gros et enflez,
> Pullens est, de cuiture tres tos avironnes.
> (Herman, *Bible*, MS. Orléans 374 bis.)

and also:

> Lessez atant.
> Ke portez tu le las puant?
> De ses boces la quiture
> Desent par vostre vesture,
> Vostre cors e robe soille
> E gesk' as garetz vus moille.
> *S. Edward le conf.*, Michel, 1979.

The reference to Michel is inaccurate. Michel in 1836, in his *Chroniques Anglo-Normandes* (Rouen, Tom. I, pp. 119-126) published a short extract from the *Estoire de Seint Aedward le Rei,* verses 4511-4638, where Godefroy's citation will be looked for in vain. Godefroy's reference to l. 1979 is correct for the edition of the poem published by H. R. Luard in 1858, in the *Lives of Edward the Confessor,* which forms vol. 3 of the series of *Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain,* better known as the Rolls series. This volume contains not alone the French poem, the work of an anonymous monk of Westminster, but also its Latin original, the *Vita Beati Edvardi Regis et Confessoris* of Ailred. The word occurs in the following context. A cripple covered with festering sores makes six pilgrimages to Rome to be cured, but in vain. He can be cured, the Pope tells him, by being carried to church on the King's back. The Latin text has (ll. 319-23):

> Auribus ut regis hoc instrepit, exilit alto
> Descendens solio, trunco supponitur aegro.
> Non sordem *saniemque* timens, fit purpura regis
> Tacta viri manibus squamosis, pectore pectus,
> Formosum foedo tactum collum quoque collo.

It will be seen again that the French poet renders *sanies* by *cuiture.* Luard in his Glossary and in his English rendering of the poem, found in the same volume, correctly renders *cuiture* by 'matter,' 'pus.'

Pullens in the first passage is, of course, *purulentus.* The MS. is not accessible. If the reference is correct, the verses are probably taken from Herman's paraphrase of Job, II, 8: *Satan . . . . percussit Job ulcere pessimo, a planta pedis usque ad verticem ejus, qui testa saniem radebat, sedens in sterquilinio.* (Cf. Wyclif's rendering of this passage below.) There is, in any case, a clear indication that the sense of *cuiture* is not *brûlure* or *cautère,* but *sanies.*

It is, I suspect, because Godefroy failed to render *cuiture* accurately that English lexicographers went searching far afield for kindred of the word in its English form. The Middle-English Dictionary of Stratmann and Bradley does not even suggest a French original for *qviter* and its variant forms, but refers to L. G. *kwater,* H. G. *Koder,* 'mucus,' 'phlegm,' as an explanation of the word. The *New English Dictionary* doubtfully offers *cuiture* to explain English *quitter,* but adds that O. F. *cuiture* is not recorded in the specific sense of the English word, which it defines as 'pus,' 'suppurating matter'; 'a purulent discharge from a wound or sore.' It is cited from a fairly large number of texts ranging from the thirteenth to the close of the seventeenth century, and still persists in farriery in its derived sense of an 'ulcer or suppurating sore on the coronet of a horse's foot.' A glance at one or two of the following passages, cited in the N. E. D. under *quitter* will show the identity of the English word with *cuiture* in the passages taken from Godefroy:

1382 Wyclif, Job II, 8 [*Job*] *with a sherd scrapide awei the quyture.*

c. 1400 Lanfranc's *Cirurg.* 37. *Thilke quyttere & blood schulde lette the helynge of the wounde.*

c. 1440 Promptorium Parvulorum 525/2 *Whytowre, of a soore, sanies.*

1686. Plot. Staffordsh. 305. *The nourishing juice . . . . emptying itself by those corrupted sores in a quitture or sanies.*

I desire to thank Dr. Blondheim, who suggested to me the subject of this note, for giving me various indications utilized in it.

H. LOSS.

U. S. Naval Academy,
Annapolis, Md.

ACCESSORY VOWELS

(*Voyelles prosthétiques et autres*)

"Une voyelle prosthétique se développe devant *s* suivi d'une consonne; les groupes initiaux *sp, st, sc, sm, sn* deviennent ainsi *esp, est, esc, esm, sn: sponsa* > *esposa* > *espouse* > *épouse*, etc. Ce développement remonte très haut; la voyelle accessoire se montre déjà dans le latin populaire, où elle s'écrivait par *i* ou *e: iscala, iscripsit, escola, escripsi, escriptura,* etc.; le plus ancien exemple, *iscripta,* se trouve dans une inscription de l'an 197." [1] In the terminology of Sweet, this 'voyelle accessoire' is a glide. According to Brunot, "C'était devenu une habitude populaire d'appuyer le groupe sur la voyelle." [2] The view that this vowel was an 'on-glide' or supporting vowel to pronounce the *s* + consonant group necessitates different explanations for the development of a vowel in *knif* > *canif, knödel* > *quenelle,* etc.; *bollwerk* > *boulevard, partner* > *partenaire, bulldog* > *bouledogue; toŭrtreau* > *tourtereau; brick* > *brique, halt* > *halte, check* > *chèque;* and of *é* 'parasite' in *émouchet, écraser, épicéa.*[3]

If the *i* in *iscripta* is an 'on-glide,' it has nothing in common with the *a* in *canif,* the *e* in *bouledogue,* the *a* in *avacances,* or the *é* in *écraser.*

If an Arab, an East Indian, a Frenchman, Spaniard or Italian is given the following sentence to read: "I want to speak Spanish," he reads it in this manner: "I want to speak(e)(i)Spanish." In this case there is no 'parasitic' *i* or *e* before *sp* of *speak,* but there is before *sp* of *Spanish.* The word preceding *speak* ends in a vowel, and the word preceding *Spanish* ends in a consonant.

Nyrop says (*ibid.,* p. 439), "il semble qu'à l'origine il [ẽ] ne se produisait pas quand le mot précédent se terminait par une voyelle." The similar phenomenon in Italian, *lo studio,* but *con istudio, la scuola,* but *in iscuola* (examples cited by Nyrop, *ibid.,* tome 1, p. 439) is well known.

In the present day pronunciation of French, Italian, Spanish, Russian, Arabic and Hindustani-speaking persons (and probably

[1] Nyrop, *Grammaire historique de la langue française,* I[3], (Copenhagen, 1914), p. 439.

[2] *Histoire de la langue française,* I, (Paris, 1905), p. 74.

[3] Chosen among other examples cited by Nyrop, *ibid.,* pp. 440, 441, 444.

of other peoples of non-Germanic race) the *e* or *i* does not appear before *s* + a consonant when the preceding word ends in a vowel; and as this is also historically true, it suggests that the vowel is not connected with the *s* + consonant, but is determined by the end-consonant of the preceding word.

On listening to a Spanish pronunciation of *speak,* it is readily observed that the vowel placed before *s* is not an 'on-glide' at all but is separated from the *s* by a noticeable pause.

In my article on "Breath-control and End-consonants in French and English" in *Modern Philology,* VII (1916), p. 101, I have pointed out that "in French, an end-consonant is preceded by a momentary stoppage of breath and followed by an explosion" or in other words, that all consonants in French are pronounced as if initial as opposed to the pronunciation of end-consonants in English (except at the end of certain consonant groups) where the expulsion of breath is continuous until interrupted by the closure of the tongue against the palate or the closing of the lips for the consonant.

Thus in present day French a consonant is never pronounced by means of a preceding vowel, and consequently there are no 'on-glides' in French. Experiments indicate that end-consonants in all of the Germanic languages are pronounced as in English, that is with a continuous pronunciation or with an 'on-glide' as the position for the consonant is taken, while, on the other hand, the break in the air-current after the vowel and before the end-consonant, the latter being subsequently pronounced by means of an explosion or indistinct vowel, is characteristic perhaps of all languages other than the Germanic. Such an 'explosion' or indistinct neutral vowel is heard after *d* in English *robbed* or after *t* in English *rapt.* This vowel differs as to quantity and quality within rather wide limits, and its quality is determined by the nature of the preceding and following consonants. If the tongue remains in an elevated position as it will in the sentence 'I want to speak Spanish,' this supporting vowel will sound like *i* or *e* because of the high position of the tongue for *k* and *s.* The *i* or *e* or vowel of varying quality however is not the supporting vowel of *sp,* but of *k.*

In *iscala, escola,* etc., it was perhaps natural for the mind to associate the *i* or the *e,* that is the explosion of the end-consonant of the preceding word, not with the end-consonant of which it was the supporting vowel, but with the *s* of the following word, because

any beginning vowel was likewise pronounced with the end-consonant of a preceding word, though the mind conceived of it as belonging to the word of which it was etymologically a part.

Not only are the 'parasitic' *e*'s of words of the type *bouledogue* explained as the explosion or indistinct supporting vowel of the preceding consonant, but one need seek no other explanation of the 'parasitic' *é* of words of the type *écrevisse*.

As shown for *trace* in my article "Syllable and Word Division in French and English," *Modern Philology*, XXIX (1922), p. 321, a similar explosion or vowel follows each consonant of a French consonant group. The exaggeration of such an explosion would appear as a separate independent vowel and thus account for the development of *canif* from *knif*, etc.

The supporting vowel in all of these and similar examples then is not an 'on-glide,' but the explosion of a preceding consonant. Romance and Slavic languages, Hindustani, Arabic, and other languages using an explosion to pronounce end-consonants have this phenomenon in common; the Germanic languages because of their habit of gliding up to the consonant on the preceding vowel present no examples of this type.

Likewise the sound indicated by *a* in representations of the faulty English pronunciation of Greeks, Italians, etc., as for example: *it-a-did* are explained in the same manner. The sound figured by *a* is the explosion of the *t*, etc.

JAMES L. BARKER.

University of Utah.

REVIEWS

A dictionary of the printers and booksellers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1668 to 1725 by HENRY R. PLOMER. With the help of H. G. Aldis, E. R. McC. Dix, G. J. Gray, and R. B. McKerrow. Edited by Arundell Esdaile. Printed for the Bibliographical Society, at the Oxford University Press. 1922. 8vo. xii + 342 pp.

Among the most significant contributions of recent British literary scholarship are certain productions of the Bibliographical Society, the work of such masters as Pollard, Greg, McKerrow, and Esdaile. One of the most useful undertakings of the Society

has been its dictionaries of early English printers and booksellers, which thus far have covered the years from 1457 to 1667. Mr. Plomer's *Dictionary* now extends this account to the year 1725.

In evaluating a work of this nature, where it is impossible to check more than a fraction of the details, the reviewer must proceed on the principle of *ex pede Herculem:* he must consider the methods appropriate to such a task as Mr. Plomer's and then, by means of representative cross-sections of the work, must determine, first, the methods employed by the compiler and their adequacy, and, secondly, with how much tact, accuracy, and thoroughness the methods employed have been carried out.

What must be done to achieve a satisfactory dictionary of printers and booksellers between 1668 and 1725? In the first place, there are certain primary sources adequate use of which is absolutely essential. There are the records of the Stationers' Company, both those which are unpublished and those which have been printed—notably the Eyre and Rivington *Transcript of the registers* from 1640 to 1708/9. There are the carefully indexed volumes of Arber's *Term catalogues.* There is the long list of printers and booksellers in Dunton's *Life and errors.* There are, also, the title-pages of the books themselves which were published during the period. Several thousands of these should be examined and a special inspection made of the writings of the better-known authors. One should also run through journals of the period to note the publishers. Then there are a number of important secondary sources, such as Nichols' *Literary anecdotes,* Timperley's *Dictionary of printers and printing,* and various monographs published by the Bibliographical Society. Such are the minimum requirements. In addition, the devoted compiler might search through the correspondence of authors, through parish registers for the important bookmen, through accounts of trials involving copyright, blasphemy, or libel, and might collect data from a study of the type and ornaments of books of the period. But, as life is short and of the making of books no end, to tap these last sources is hardly mandatory.

A glance at Mr. Plomer's list of abbreviations and a skimming of his text indicate that he has used the major manuscript and printed records. It is, not, however, thus easily apparent whether Mr. Plomer made that inspection of the books and journals of the

period essential to a thorough performance of his task. To determine this let us examine a number of works by better-known writers—books which could not have been overlooked in a systematic investigation. Let us select, say, Defoe, Dryden, and Milton, and let us limit ourselves to first authorized editions, since these obviously have a special significance as indicating relationship between the author and publisher. It at once becomes apparent that Mr. Plomer has neglected this essential research. Otherwise, we should be told not merely that J. Brotherton issued an insignificant musical dictionary, but that he published the first edition of *Captain Singleton;* we should read of W. Davis, not simply that his last entry in the *Term catalogues* was made in 1686, but that he was named on the title-page of the first edition of *Absalom and Achitophel;* John Starkey would be given similar credit for *Paradise regained.* And, had the publications by or attributed to the more celebrated authors been systematically reviewed, many names would have appeared in the *Dictionary* which are now entirely omitted. A casual check for merely four writers —Defoe, Pope, Steele, and Swift—reveals dozens of omissions.[1]

Apparently, also, Mr. Plomer failed to search—at least to search systematically—through the files of journals. Had he done so Thomas Warner, the publisher of *The British journal,* one of the more significant newspapers, would not have been omitted from the *Dictionary;* John Peele would have been listed as the publisher of the important *London journal,* and John Morphew, as the publisher of the *Tatler;* A. Baldwin would have been associated with the *Guardian* and the *Lay-monk;* and so forth.

To be sure, the required search through the publications of the day would have been long and dusty labor. But he who undertakes a dictionary of biography commits himself to such work. And the labor is not so oppressive as at first appears. Given a great library, one can easily inspect over a hundred title-pages a

[1] For instance, Henry Roberts, Francis Higgins, G. Risk, J. Harrison, in Castle Alley in Cornhill (1715), E. More, T. Warner, W. Graves, in St. James's St. (1720), W. Chetwood, W. Boreham, John Henly, R. Burleigh, A. Moore, T. Payne, near Stationers-Hall (1720), B. Creak, Charles Lillie, John Hyde, Robert Owen, J. Temple, George Faulkner, and Timothy Atkins. Lack of space prevents my recording the works in which their names are found.

day; and the chronological arrangement of the extensive Nichols collection of newspapers at the Bodleian facilitates a search such as Mr. Plomer should have undertaken—and should have undertaken no matter what the effort, for its returns are authoritative and sure to be generous, whereas the effect of neglecting it is to vitiate the whole *Dictionary*.

Let us now see how fully Mr. Plomer has employed such avenues of research as apparently he did follow; and let us begin with the MS. records of the Stationers' Company. These records may be divided for our purposes into three classes. The first is the registers to 1709, the year before the Copyright Act of 8 Anne, c. 19 became law. These registers have been printed. The second is the registers from that date, for books were registered after the Act as they had been before it. Finally there are the apprentices' and freemen's registers and the court books of the Company, in which are recorded matters of vital importance to a dictionary of printers and booksellers—dates of apprenticeship and of 'clothing,' names of apprentices' masters, elections, etc.

For the purpose of a representative cross-section by which to check Mr. Plomer's compendium I have selected three publishers of moderate repute—Samuel Ballard, John Peele, and Abigail Baldwin (not Anne Baldwin, as Mr. Plomer has it, perhaps after the error in Nichols' *Literary anecdotes*); two very prominent men —John Morphew and James Roberts; and two men not mentioned at all by Plomer—Samuel Aris and Thomas Warner— these last to see whether their omission would be explained by their non-appearance in the Registers.

A search of the MS. records of the Company for these men shows astonishing deficiencies in the *Dictionary*. Thomas Warner, missing in the *Dictionary*, appears half a dozen times in the registers;[2] all those in question, except Abigail Baldwin and Warner appear in the apprentices' and freemen's registers and the court books, which give precise information as to dates of apprenticeship, of admittance to freedom, of the master to whom bound, etc.[3]

[2] See registers under dates of 4 June and 17 July 1716, 17 May 1717, 8 May 1718, 1 Feb. 1722, and 21 Dec. 1723.

[3] Samuel Ballard, son of Samuel, bound to John Salusbury 4 Sept. 1693 (Apprentices' register for that date), admitted to freedom of Company 3 Mar. 1700/1 (Freemen's register for that date), clothed 3 Mar 1711/2

In the case of *none* of the men in question has Mr. Plomer included this information. When we join to these omissions the fact that the registers give information as to the names of the Masters and Wardens which is missing in Mr. Plomer's book, it becomes evident that his use of the MS. documents can scarcely have been much more than nominal. As far as the Company records are concerned, his source seems to have been almost entirely the Eyre and Rivington *Transcript.*

Mr. Plomer's failure in particular to record all the Masters of the Company during his period—*ipso facto* important men—is doubly surprising when we remember that lists of these Masters have been printed in Arber's *Transcript* [4] and in the Eyre and Rivington *Transcript* (in the latter of which the Wardens also are given).[5] These Masters afford a dramatic instance of what Mr. Plomer's work has suffered through insufficient use of the Company records. A check through the list of the thirty-four men who held this important post between 1668 and 1725 shows six who do not appear at all in Mr. Plomer's *Dictionary,*[6] although one of these men (William Phillips) had been Master seven times; it shows seventeen who, though in the *Dictionary* (or in Mr. Plo-

(Court book, 1697-1717, f. 197; John Peele, bound to Daniel Browne 4 Dec. 1710 (Apprentices' register for that date), admitted to freedom 7 Apr. 1718 (Freemen's register for that date), clothed 2 Nov. 1719 (Court book, 1717-33, p. 60), chosen Under Warden 1749 and 1750 (Court book, 1741-51, pp. 441 and 478); John Morphew, son of Stephen, bound to Edward Jones 2 Dec. 1695 (Apprentices' register), admitted to freedom 1 Feb. 1702/3 (Freeman's register), clothed 2 Oct. 1710 (Court book, 1697-1717, f. 184ª); James Roberts (see below, p. 169); Samuel Aris, son of John, bound to William Sayes 7 June 1703 (Apprentices' register), admitted to freedom 5 Mar. 1710/1 (Freemen's register), clothed 5 Nov. 1723 (Court book, 1717-33, p. 160).

If it were urged that these records are not easy of access, it could be answered that they are not impossible of access, as this note proves; and, in any case, Mr. Plomer should have given definite indication of the extent to which he used or did not use them.

[4] Cf. Rivington's article in vol. v, pp. lxi-lxxv.

[5] See the 'Contents' in each volume. How could Mr. Plomer overlook this source when he was one of the collaborators in the *Transcript?*

[6] Hugh Herrington (Master 1685), John Towne (1688), Ambrose Isted (1690-1), William Phillips (1700-2, 1709-12), Edward Darrel (1707), and John Knaplock (1722-4).

mer's earlier *Dictionary*), are not described there as Master;[7] and it shows that one man described as Master by Mr. Plomer[8] was not Master at all.

A similar illustration of the debilitating effect upon his work of Mr. Plomer's omissions in research can be gained by taking one of the men we have chosen as a sample—James Roberts of Warwick Lane—and contrasting what Mr. Plomer has found out about him with what he might have found out had his research been more thorough—not had he concentrated his attentions on Roberts, which, of course, no one could expect, but had he simply done the work implied in a well-considered plan of investigation for a book such as his. Had the records of the Company been thoroughly used, Mr. Plomer, instead of merely drawing from Nichols the date of Roberts's death, his age at that time, and the erroneous statement that he had been Master three times, would have learned his father, the condition and date of his apprenticeship, the date of his being admitted to the freedom of the Company, the date of his being clothed, his election as Under Warden, as Upper Warden, and four times as Master of the Company.[9] And had the important authors of the period been searched we should learn from Mr. Plomer not merely that Roberts issued a forgotten work by J. Gilbert, but that he published first editions for Addison, Congreve, Defoe, Mandeville, Pope, Prior, Steele, and Young.[10]

[7] W. Leak [so the Eyre and Rivington *Transcript;* the Arber reads 'William Seale'] (1670), Ralph Smith (1672), Abel Roper (1676), Robert White (1677), Roger Norton (1678, 1682-4, 1687), Samuel Mearne (1679, 1681-2), Thomas Vere (1681), John Bellinger (1686, 1693), Edward Brewster (1689, 1692), John Simms (1694-5), Richard Simpson (1704-5), Walter Kettilby (1706), Charles Harper (1708), Daniel Browne (1713), Nicholas Boddington (1716-17), John Sprint (1720-1), John Walthoe (1725-6).

[8] Thomas Roycroft. In 1675, when Mr. Plomer states he was Master, he was really a Warden (1674-5). George Sawbridge was Master then.

[9] James Roberts, son of Robert Roberts, printer, was admitted 'by patrimony,' 7 Nov. 1692 to the freedom of the Company (Freemen's register) and clothed 1 July 1695 (Court book, 1683-97, f. 227). He was chosen Under Warden 1723 and 1724, Upper Warden 1727, and Master 1729, 1730, 1731, and 1732 (Court book, 1717-33, pp. 150, 179, 271, 335, 376, 427, and 454).

[10] For instance, Addison's *The old Whig. On the state of the Peerage* (1719), Congreve's *An impossible thing* (1720), Defoe's *Journal of the*

Although Mr. Plomer has thus lamentably failed to tap essential sources, he has made fairly conscientious use of the sources he really did draw from. A check of the first fifteen pages of volume three of Arber's *Term catalogues* shows only three omissions from the *Dictionary* of names occurring in the *Catalogues*.[11] A check of the printers mentioned by Dunton—some 150—shows only two omissions.[12] On the other hand, both Aris and Warner on our list, who were omitted from the *Dictionary*, are in Nichols—in the index too.[13] It is difficult, also, to see why certain information in Dunton is not used when other no more important information is.[14] It is, moreover, surprising to find Mr. Plomer alleging of Dunton, whom he names as a chief source (p. ix), that 'he was a shrewd observer . . . and his judgements . . . may be accepted.' As a matter of fact, Dunton's judgments are absurd, as can be objectively demonstrated.[15]

plague year (1722), Mandeville's *Fable of the bees* (1714), Pope's *Court poems* (1716), Prior's *Second collection of poems* (1716), Steele's *Romish ecclesiastical history* (1714), and Young's *Universal passion. Satire I* (1725). For Swift see Temple Scott's Bibliography (*Prose works* XII, 136 and 137).

[11] M. M. (Arber, III, 3), Eleanor Smith (III, 5; but, although not mentioned even in a cross-reference in the *Dictionary* we are considering, she is in Mr. Plomer's earlier *Dictionary*), J. Everingham (III, 12).

[12] George Swinnock and his father (Dunton, *Life and errors*, ed. 1818, I, 224).

[13] Nichols, *Literary anecdotes* (1812-13), I, 292 and IV, 93.

[14] Cf., for instance, Richard Chiswell, Dorman Newman, Gilliflower, Evets, Ralph Smith, and Eliphal Jay in Dunton, I, 204, 211, 213-14, 219, 222, and 227.

[15] In the cases where he gives a verdict on contemporary printers (I, 204 sqq.), 132 judgments are definitely favorable—many of these extravagantly so; five are mildly unfavorable; two are strongly unfavorable. Now, it is evident that no craft is made up of so large a proportion of admirable individuals. Besides, Dunton's judgments are individually ridiculous. Thus the bookseller Walwyn is equalled as a poet to Dryden (I, 218). Mr. Shrowsbury, who 'may justly be called *Venerable* for his heavenly aspect,' 'is familiarly acquainted with all the Books that are extant in any Language' (I, 222). A nobleman is described as 'descended from a pious and antient Family; and, being a true Patriot and generous Man, is universally admired' (I, 347). Who was this paragon? That old rip Lord Wharton, the most notorious rake of the age! But here is Dunton's most brilliant performance: 'Mr. *Collier*. He is a breathing

Despite the fundamental weaknesses of Mr. Plomer's performance, however, the *Dictionary* is still a very useful work. The collection and ordering of many names, the distinguishing of men of the same name, the listing of places of business with the dates when there—all this is valuable. But the difficulty is that a book so outwardly imposing as Mr. Plomer's and so genuinely valuable may, by apparently announcing the completion of a task, keep others from finishing it, and thus because a work is half-done it may never be done. That is why it has been necessary somewhat ruthlessly to show that Mr. Plomer's work is merely a nucleus, that important sources remain to be tapped, Mr. Plomer's book, indeed, being a specimen of unmethodized antiquarianism rather than of scientific scholarship.

F. B. Kaye.

Northwestern University.

Sigfús Blöndal: *Islandsk-dansk Ordbog.* Hoved-Medarbejdere: Björg Þ. Blöndal, Jón Ófeigsson, Holger Wiehe. 1. Halvbind (A-L). Reykjavík og København, H. Aschehoug & Co., 1920-22. 4°. xi, 480 pp.

Icelandic-English Dictionary by Geir T. Zoëga. Second edition enlarged. Reykjavík, Sigurður Kristjánsson, 1922. 8°. 631 pp.

Islandsk Grammatik. Islandsk Nutidssprog, af Valtýr Guðmundsson. København, H. Hagerup, 1922. 8°. viii, 191 pp.

Jakob Jóh. Smári: *Íslenzk setningafræði.* Reykjavík, Ársæll Árnason, 1920. 8°. 279, x pp.

The difference between Old and Modern Icelandic is not generally well understood by foreign scholars, partly due to the fact that the spelling of the modern tongue is so conservative that a modern

Library; and for Metaphysical Learning and good Oratory, he bears the bell from most that can be named. I know of none that equal him in these respects, except it be Dr. South, Dr. Stanhope, and Mr. Norris, &c.' (I, 370). That '&c.' is inspired.

text to all appearances has a great similarity to an old one. Yet the language has undergone considerable change, particularly in sounds and vocabulary, but neither of these has been adequately studied hitherto. The great majority of the old words is, to be sure, still in use (except, of course, those of the poetic language), but very numerous additions have been made to the vocabulary during the later centuries, especially in the last hundred years, through borrowing or modification of foreign words and chiefly through formation of new words from native stems. The dictionaries of the modern language which so far have been published conveyed only a faint idea of this vast increase in the vocabulary, because they have all been on a small scale and thus covered only the most common words and phrases. But with the appearance of the first half of Mr. Blöndal's Icelandic-Danish Dictionary, a work has at last seen the light which gives a really good picture of the modern language. It is published with the support of the Danish and the Icelandic governments, and not only does it show very fully the literary language, especially of the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries, but it also includes a large number of words, which have never been seen in print, and it frequently notes in what districts or parts of the country these words are particularly used. For this Mr. Blöndal has drawn largely upon the collections of the late Dr. Björn M. Ólsen who for many summers traversed various parts of the country for that purpose. Furthermore throughout the dictionary the pronunciation of every word is given in phonetic characters; this, however, does not make pretense to scientific accuracy in every respect because so little has been done in that field hitherto. It will nevertheless be a great help to all users of the dictionary, and a full exposition of the phonetic system by Mr. Ófeigsson is promised with the second half. The dictionary does not lay claim to completeness nor to giving the history of the language, although it makes a very substantial contribution to the history of many words, filled as it is with quotations and phrases of all kinds. In a preliminary preface the author states that he has made special efforts to give good explanations of everything connected with popular culture in its widest sense, superstitions, customs, tools, methods of working, and the like, in order to save these from oblivion, as great changes are now taking place in Iceland, and people are fast discarding old things for new. The

alphabetical arrangement has offered some difficulties on account of the confusion in modern spelling, and a special plan has been adopted, the principal difference of which from the customary consists in treating *y* (*ý*) as *i* (*í*), these sounds having now become identical. This looks somewhat awkward and it will take people some time to get used to it. There have been several collaborators, among whom the Dane Mr. Holger Wiehe deserves praise for his excellent Danish translations. The work is printed in a small but very clear type, and is in every respect well and attractively made up. The second half was scheduled to appear two years ago, but due to a printers' strike it has been delayed; this year we can, however, expect to see it completed.

A new edition of Mr. Zoëga's Icelandic-English Dictionary is indeed very welcome. The first edition appeared nearly twenty years ago, and has been out of print for a long time. This second edition is much enlarged, and makes a very handy and useful dictionary of the modern language for the student as well as the traveller.

While many grammars of Modern Icelandic have been published as text-books for schools, a more comprehensive practical manual has been lacking. This want has now been filled, as far as phonology and accidence are concerned, by Professor Valtýr Guðmundsson's Icelandic Grammar which is written in Danish. As it is not an historical grammar the author has chosen to present the matter in what he considered the most practical form. Contrary to the custom observed in grammars of Old Icelandic the arrangement here is throughout according to endings, since the author maintains that the grouping by stems is only appreciated by philologists and is apt to mislead those not familiar with the older Germanic languages. In this he is possibly right, although it does not make much difference. The grammar covers the literary language which, of course, in various respects differs from the spoken tongue and is closer to Old Icelandic. Most novel and therefore most difficult to write and hence most open to criticism is the chapter dealing with changes of sounds, which fills over twenty pages. There is no pretense made to analyse the sounds very fully, but it seems to me that from his point of view the author has succeeded in giving an exposition of this matter which will be found sufficient for all practical purposes. The value of

the book is greatly enhanced by an index of all words in the part dealing with accidence.

Even less than the phonology has the syntax of Modern Icelandic been studied. But here the conformity between the old and the new is greater, because the ancient prose writings have commonly served as models for the writers of the later centuries, especially of the last two. An attempt has now been made to present also this side of the language in Mr. Smári's book on Icelandic syntax. This includes naturally the old language, but chiefly in so far as it agrees with modern usage, upon which the principal stress is laid. In this respect it is the first work of its kind to appear in print, and is very creditable and will be found highly useful to any student of the language. Many new Icelandic words for technical terms are met with in this and other philological works of late years, and they represent one phase of the recent development of the language.

HALLDÓR HERMANNSSON.

Cornell University.

Rivas and Romanticism in Spain. By E. ALLISON PEERS. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1923.

Because of the lack of an authoritative work on the Spanish romantic movement as a whole, the critic of any particular phase of the period feels the need to preface his work with a new attempt at a definition of the movement. Professor Peers evidently sharing the feeling for this need, has given the clearest and most precise statement of Spanish Romanticism possible in the limited space of a short introduction. In Part I, constituting the first three chapters of the book, this introductory statement is further elaborated by a careful study of the evolution of Rivas' esthetic ideas. Thus, in his study of Romanticism Professor Peers has been happily aided by his choice of Rivas, for although the Duke was not a prolific writer, he represents in fairly exact proportions the varying phases of the literature of his time. And so this first part will be an invaluable guide in the general study of Spanish Romanticism which still remains to be done.

The first chapter, "The Appeal of Rivas to his Age," although largely biographical, begins with a discussion of the effect of the poet's death upon his countrymen. The aged, aristocratic Duke was quickly replaced in the public mind by a legendary "patriotic young soldier-poet, worthy follower of Lope and Cervantes, etc." The author shows us how Rivas constantly kept before his readers' eyes the adventurous days of his youth, and thus himself contributed in no small degree to the Rivas legend.

Rivas represented the two main currents of Spanish Romanticism, that of a revival of the medieval romance and the drama of the Golden Age, and that of a revolt against pseudo-classicism. It was due to the former tendency, to the revival of the spirit of Old Spain, that he had so great an appeal to his countrymen even at the time of his death in 1865, long after the wane of Romanticism. It is in the second chapter, "Revival and Revolt, 1824-5," that Professor Peers makes an interesting study of the Romantic aspects of Rivas' two chief works, the *Moro Expósito* and *Don Álvaro*. The former represents the element of revival in Spanish Romanticism, the latter the element of revolt.

In the third chapter, "A Romantic Made and Lost," we have a study of the whole development of Rivas' Romanticism from *El Paso Honroso* of 1812 to the *Leyendas* of 1854. The germs of Romanticism are revealed in Rivas' early work long before he came under the influence of French and English literature. If he yielded to the spirit of French Romanticism in *Don Álvaro,* his subsequent efforts are inspired rather by the earlier and more national type of Romanticism. In this sense only, he is a "Romantic lost." He continued to excel in narrative literature, for which he seemed better endowed than for the lyric or dramatic *genres*.

He who goes to Spanish Romanticism to study its philosophic aspects will have an easy task or, rather, no task at all. It is art rather than thought that the critic must look for. Professor Peers is well aware of this; he says, "Like most of his Spanish contemporaries Rivas cared little for the ideas that lay beneath poetry or drama. He made no claim to be a thinker." And, accordingly, we find in the second part of the book the following chapters: "The Poet of Light and Color"; "The Poet of the South"; "The Influence of England," in which chapter we find definite proofs of

Rivas' indebtedness to Scott, Byron, and Shakespeare; Chapter VII, the last chapter of the book, is entitled "Religion." Up to this point Professor Peers has not looked for a view or reading of life. This he now seeks in Rivas' religious outlook. Rivas was an orthodox Catholic; "Catholicism and fatalism cannot go hand in hand, etc."; how can the fatalism that runs through all his works be harmonised with his religion? After much discussion it seems clear at least that the Christian element is predominant in Rivas' works. But all this seems quite inconsequential. A heavy fate hung over all romantic characters; the fate in *Don Álvaro* differs only in the rather artificial method of its representation; this method proved effective on the stage, but cannot withstand a critical analysis. And Professor Peers seems to have reached this conclusion himself before he came to his last chapter, *viz.*, p. 31; to the question as to what the meaning and purpose of Rivas' Destiny is, he says: "The best reply is perhaps an indirect one: that Rivas, whose works, like those of most Spanish Romantics, were never distinguished by depth of thought, gave very little attention to the matter at all. His object was to create a certain atmosphere and impression, in which he was signally successful." This statement seems to settle the problem of the last chapter in advance, and thereby render it superfluous.

Where Professor Peers excels is in his study of Rivas' esthetics: his high color effects and his fond portrayal of the splendors of southern Spain; and in his study of the English sources of Rivas' works. Professor Peers' book is not only commendable as a valuable contribution to the study of Rivas and Spanish Romanticism, but also as a new high standard of Spanish literary criticism of the period.

EDWIN BUCHER WILLIAMS.

University of Pennsylvania.

SAMUEL C. CHEW, *Byron in England: His Fame and After-Fame* London, John Murray. New York, Scribners, 1924.

Professor Chew, who is probably the ablest Byron scholar in this country, has produced in his *Byron in England* one of the two or three outstanding memorials of the centenary year of Byron's

death. This impressive volume of 415 pages does for the first time what should obviously have been done before: it traces the history of Byron's vogue and Byron's influence in his own literature. It is creditable to cis-Atlantic scholarship that this task has been assumed by an American scholar and ably carried through.

The reasons why this necessary work has waited so long for its accomplishment are of moment to an understanding of Byron's vogue in British literature. English criticism has but seldom been able to get away from the moral problem of Byron. British writers and British scholars can not understand (with rare exceptions) that, for literary history, what matters is Byron's poetic force. Consequently they have talked endlessly about his personality and his wife, and very little about the power and meaning of his verse, and much of that discussion has been wrong. The wax and wane of an interest in Byron is almost a history of Victorian morality, no less than of Victorian taste, and of subsequent moralities and subsequent tastes. Professor Chew does not labor this point, but in view of the enormous industry which has gone to the making of his book, it would be ungracious to complain.

The fifteen chapters of the volume are rather strictly concerned with Byroniana, Byronic criticism, and the like. For instance, Professor Chew has ruled out any study of the possible diffusion of a Byronic influence in the great Victorian poets, confining himself to the strict line of his problem. This is wise, although it obviously leaves a gap to be filled in by later investigators. The fifteen chapters treat, roughly, in chronological order, the "case" of Byron.

After an introductory flourish in chapter one, the author proceeds to a study of such Byroniana as appeared before the separation. Chapter three discusses the literature of the separation period; chapters four and five present a great amount of new information regarding the forgeries, imitations and continuations of *Don Juan;* chapter six is an important discussion of the controversy over *Cain;* and the succeeding chapter marshals the Byroniana appearing between 1816 and 1824. Professor Chew's categories after this point do not seem to be mutually exclusive. In one way or another however, he discusses critical views of the poet held by his great contemporaries, Byron in fiction, Byronic apocrypha and the literature evoked by the death of Byron—a

chapter which surely belongs further forward in the book. The third division of the study (chapters XII through XV) is a history of English interest in Byron from the mid-nineteenth century to the present day. A vast bibliography of some 1200 titles concludes the study.

There are some minor errors of statement which it would be pretentious to point out. Professor Chew will himself correct them in any revision of he work. What is of greater consequence is the merit of the book. It is exhaustive and authoritative. It does for British literature what Estève's famous volume does for Byron in France, what Professor Leonard's monograph accomplishes for the poet's American vogue. But few items, and these of small moment, have escaped Professor Chew's researches. On the other hand, the book is, aside from the question of organization, written with extraordinary literary skill, and good writing is in scholarly matters not so common that it can be passed over without comment. And in the third place Professor Chew's own attitude toward Byron is the right one. He seeks to illumine the poetry through the man, not the man through the poetry. He deals with the personality of the noble lord as a problem in literary history, not as a problem in casuistry. He has no illusions about Byron's pettinesses, but equally he knows that Byron is, with all his faults, a great poet and a great and potent force. Professor Chew is to be congratulated upon the happy termination of so enormous a labor.

HOWARD MUMFORD JONES.

University of Texas.

Die deutsche Schweizerbegeisterung in den Jahren 1750-1815. Von EDUARD ZIEHEN. (Deutsche Forschungen, Heft 8). Frankfurt am Main, 1922. vi, 214 pp.

It is no abstruse or uncertain theory that Dr. Ziehen wishes to prove in this dissertation. His object is rather to essay an exhaustive investigation of a manifest literary tendency, one which strikes every student of classical German literature, namely the great interest in Switzerland and its people evinced by German writers of that period. That he has succeeded in presenting the results of his study in a clear and resourceful manner can not be denied.

In the details of his presentation the author follows neither the chronological nor the biographical order. Irrespective of these methods, he prefers to trace the development of those ideas and enthusiasms which find their highest artistic expression in Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell* and which Ziehen sums up under the neologism *Schweizerbegeisterung*, with its parallels *philhelvetism* in England, *philhelvétisme*[1] in France, and *filelvetismo* in Italy. The widespread appeal of this movement, popularized in Germany by many factors, esthetic, political and ethnological, and promoted by the writings of a Rousseau, is explained by the fact that it embodied the yearning for an ideal which seemed capable of realization.

Under the treatment which the author gives it, the subject proves very comprehensive indeed. It includes such problems as the attitude toward nature in literature and the political and social relations existing between individual and community and between the people and the state. It raises questions as to the best form of government and as to what constitutes a nation. More concretely, it studies the political, ethnological, social and cultural relations between Germany and Switzerland and the contribution of German helvetism to the reconstruction of Germany in 1815.

The antecedents of the movement are traced as far back as the Swiss victory at Sempach in 1386. But in the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries much apparently biased, unfavorable comment on the Swiss is also found. Early travel diaries are noted. The influence of Zwingli is appraised. Finally the effect of the ravages of the Thirty Years' War in giving Switzerland the reputation of a peaceful, envied land is set forth.

Coming now to the period of German helvetism itself, the beginnings of which coincide with the inception of the classical period, the author studies the conditions which made the movement possible. These conditions are embodied in the literary relations, personal and impersonal, of Germany and Switzerland. The controversy between Zürich and Leipzig, Albrecht von Haller's *Alpen*, the literary influence of Bodmer, Gessner, Lavater, Salis-Seewis and Hebel, the Swiss aspects of Storm and Stress,[2] German travelers

[1] P. Kohler in his study *Madame de Staël et la Suisse*, Lausanne and Paris, 1916, p. 561, has already used the word *helvétisme* to describe the same movement.

[2] Cf. the dissertation of H. Schnorf, *Sturm und Drang in der Schweiz*, Zürich, 1914.

in Switzerland, Swiss literary men residing in Germany, and finally German interest in progressive Swiss educational institutions are important elements in these relations. With the Napoleonic Wars and the temporary loss of Swiss freedom in 1798, German helvetism reaches its climax.

German enthusiasm for Switzerland, its people and its history is revealed in the works of a veritable host of writers. An important contributory to this enthusiasm is the appreciation of the natural beauty of the country. But the most essential factor of all, according to Ziehen, is the political liberty of the Swiss. It led to a great deal of political theorizing and comparison, not only in Germany but in France as well. Representatives of almost every shade of opinion discussed the subject with equal devotion. In their belief that there was much that could be commended in Swiss political institutions, such diverse geniuses as Rousseau, Condillac, Montesquieu and Voltaire, and Schubart, Matthisson, Lessing, Wieland, Herder, Frederick the Great and Goethe seemed to be of one mind. The eclipse of Swiss liberty in 1798, although it marks the beginning of a divergence of opinion regarding Switzerland, was accompanied by expressions of regret and sympathy from everywhere. No student of Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell* should lose sight of the important fact that this play, the crowning, classical expression and swan's song of German helvetism, was written under the conscious influence of the depressing conditions that prevailed in Switzerland at the time.

An inquiry into the relation of helvetism to the development of German national consciousness reveals that to the great majority of eighteenth-century writers in Germany Switzerland was essentially *German* territory, not a part of that great political medley, to be sure, which was known as *das teutsche Reich,* but an integral component of the broader conception designated as *Teutschland.* The vast body of political literature which appeared in Germany during the period of the Wars of Liberation and from which Ziehen draws quite freely, discloses the same central thought. With two sections on the relation of helvetism to Germany's reconstruction after the Napoleonic era the author brings his investigation to a close.

The dissertation is replete with the results of years of very specialized study. It contains some forty closely printed pages of bibliographical and related material. Far from restricting himself

to pure literature, the author includes not only a large amount of political and historical writing, but draws even upon archaeology (cf. footnote 25 to Chap. II) and architecture (cf. p. 138 f. and footnote 36 to Chap. IX) for evidence.

Dr. Ziehen might have done well to place more emphasis upon specific literary influences of German-Swiss writers. Thus the work of Bodmer in making Milton better known in Germany and in opposing rime, the influence of Breitinger in popularizing the hexameter, the contribution of both of these men in the field of the moral weeklies, and the work of Haller in helping to introduce Pope and Thomson could have been dwelt upon to bring out the prestige and authority enjoyed by the Swiss writers. Some stress might also have been laid upon the not inconsiderable Gallic influences (other than Rousselian) entering Germany by way of Geneva and Lausanne. Johann Christoph Schwab is an example of a German writer thus influenced, in his particular case by virtue of a protracted stay in French Switzerland.

The *Quellen und Daten,* pp. 169 ff., are unnecessarily incomplete and eclectic. Thus they contain no mention either of Hans von Waldheim's important visits to Switzerland about 1475 or of B. Sastrow's sojourn there about 1550.

The treatment of the rise of nature appreciation in literature, with special reference to Switzerland, would have a firmer, more philosophical foundation if it were based upon general principles of esthetics. Heinz Stephan, for example, in his dissertation *Die Entstehung der Rheinromantik* (Bonn, 1922), succeeds better than Ziehen in this respect, within the limits of his theme.

The last two chapters, on the relation of the subject to Germany's reconstruction in 1815, present material that is after all only of limited value and significance. In reply to the author's emphasis of the bearing of Johannes von Müller's great history of Switzerland upon German external reconstruction, it suffices here to recall Hebbel's statement (Werner ed., XII, 90-91): "es ist nicht ohne guten Grund behauptet worden, dass erst Johannes von Müller durch seine Geschichte der Eidgenossenschaft die Schweiz geistig vom deutschen Reich getrennt hat." As for Swiss influence upon German internal rehabilitation, the material is again inconclusive. To be sure, we meet repeated suggestions that German reconstruction should be effected with Switzerland as a model, but usually the writers, if their purpose is political at all, make no

express reference to the republican form of government and would use Switzerland as a model for Germany only as regards the confederative nature of the Swiss union. To the reviewer it seems an important yet regrettable fact that at this very time, when Switzerland became a democracy in the modern sense of the word (according to so good an authority as Hasbach, *Die moderne Demokratie*, Jena, 1912, p. 31), German helvetism passed its zenith and waned.

There are few misprints. Page 9, line 13: *for* Niklaus von der Flüe *read* Niklaus von der Flue; page 26, line 7: *for* 1851 *read* 1751; page 77, line 10 from bottom: *for* werder *read* weder; page 121, line 17 from bottom: *for* 24 (footnote number) *read* 42; page 190, footnotes 7 and 8 to Chap. IV: *for* Grosse *read* Grosze; page 203, footnote 51: *for* Landoet *read* Landolt.

The series of little volumes being published since the summer of 1922 by H. Haessel of Leipzig: *Die Schweiz im deutschen Geistesleben*, under the general editorship of Harry Maync of Bern, is supplementing Ziehen's work in a valuable way.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL.

Indiana University.

Histoire du théâtre français à Bruxelles au XVIIe et au XVIIIe siècle. Par Henri Liebrecht. viii + 377 pages. Paris, Champion, 1923.

The French theatre, even more than French literature, has perhaps been the strongest factor in assuring for French culture the domination which it enjoys in Belgium today. The material presented in the excellent volume here under review contributes to the confirmation of this assertion. M. Liebrecht, already known as the author of the best History of French Literature in Belgium, has obtained his documentation largely from long and diligent search in local archives, and a great part of the information which he offers is published for the first time. His painstaking work renders wholly obsolete Faber's superficial and untrustworthy *Histoire du théâtre français en Belgique* (1878-1881, 5 vol.).

M. Liebrecht covers the period of the beginning of the French theatre in Brussels and its rise and development through the eighteenth century. Thus we learn that about 1600 troupes of French "comédiens de campagne" began to appear in Brussels and com-

pete with similar troupes of English, Dutch, Italian, and Spanish players. After about 1650 only the French troupes continue to appear. Their regular annual visits assure them of a regular following which expects and receives the latest Parisian novelties. As for the plays performed during the seventeenth century, M. Liebrecht's sources furnish little information. This lack is not of capital importance, however, as we know that these were French plays that had already been produced in Paris, though more details concerning their presentation might have been of interest. The chapter on the earliest theatres in Brussels is significant because the author has found the complete specifications of one of them, a transformed "jeu de pomme." Likewise there is a considerable amount of interesting information in the chapter on the "comédiens de campagne."[1] These troupes were for the most part the same ones which toured the French provinces and a good deal is known about some of them in addition to what M. Liebrecht has discovered. Inasmuch as the early theatres in Brussels were constructed after the same fashion as the French theatres and as most of the troupes of actors which used them were French, the information concerning this period is of value to anyone studying the French theatre of that time.

With the first years of the eighteenth century begins the development of the Grand-Théâtre in Brussels, which survives today in the Théâtre de la Monnaie. The management is awarded for the most part to Frenchmen and the leading actors are usually French. During the second half of the century this theatre under the guidance of Favart, Hannetaire, and Vitzthumb acquires a distinguished reputation. It is a rival of the Comédie-Française for the distinction of being the best theatre in Europe. In its troupe, which serves as a kind of school of apprenticeship for the Comédie-Française, are to be found Dazincourt, Grandménil, and others equally well-known for their success on the Paris stage. Le Kain, Préville, and other celebrities appear as guest actors. It is considered a real honor to act at the Grand-Théâtre. The repertoire, while it numbers many of the classical French plays of the seventeenth century, is most partial to the current Paris plays and practically everything produced in the latter city is put on in Brussels

[1] M. Liebrecht is engaged upon a work on the "théâtre de campagne" which will present the most thorough study of the subject yet attempted.

as soon as possible. The spoken drama, however, especially during the second half of the century, is outweighed in the public favor by the opera and other musical forms, and M. Liebrecht necessarily devotes considerable attention to this preponderating element of the programmes. The opera too has as its chief source and model that of Paris. In fact, so close are the relations between the theatres of the two cities that all the successes and failures and the trials and tribulations of the Paris theatres are echoed in Brussels.

If one looks back over the history of the theatre in Brussels during these two centuries, one discovers, as M. Wilmotte states in the preface he has written for this volume, that there has been no flourishing and uninterrupted tradition here such as the Comédie-Française has enjoyed since the time of Molière. The foreign governors of the Flemish provinces had no interest in the intellectual development of the inhabitants, and the theatre remained to them simply a form of entertainment and diversion to which they contributed much more largely of their presence as spectators than of their financial and official support.

M. Liebrecht has handled his material in a thoroughly scholarly manner and at the same time has known how to make interesting reading out of it. True he presents a mass of details of only local interest, but, as has been pointed out, much of his information has a broader significance as well. What he has tried to do, as he himself states, is not to give simply a history of the theatre in Brussels, but to trace its place in the evolution of the theatre in Europe and especially in the development of the French theatre and the Italian opera. In both his particular and his general aim he has proceeded so efficiently as to leave little further to be said on the subject. Students of the French theatre of the period covered will find this work worthy of their attention, but at the same time they will be handicapped in using it for reference by the lack of an index of plays and of proper names, the only serious fault to be noted in connection with an otherwise excellent piece of scholarly work.

C. D. Brenner.

Princeton University.

CORRESPONDENCE

Grass and Green Wool

Rereading Professor Saintsbury's chapter on *The English Chaucerians,* included in the second volume of the *Cambridge History of English Literature,* I notice again his comment, page 249, on a passage of *The Flower and the Leaf.* He is using, doubtless, Professor Skeat's text, and he remarks on the "infelicity of diction" by which the poet compares grass to green wool. This infelicity can however be removed by an emendation which appears to me plausible.

Lines 50-52 of the poem, in Skeat's text and with his punctuation, read:

> . . . . . . wherof the grenë gras
> So small, so thik, so short, so fresh of hew,
> That most lyk to grene wol, wot I, it was.

Skeat marks *wol* for reference to the footnote, where he has: "wel (! *read* wol)." In his notes he credits Bell and Morris with the "obviously right" alteration, which was however made by Urry in 1721.

The earliest text we have of line 52, that printed in the 1598 Speght Chaucer, is:

> That most like vnto grene wel wot I it was.

If however the line originally ran:

> That most like vnto grene wel wet it was,"

and *wot* happened by clerical error to be substituted for *wet,* it would be the natural move of a text-meddler to insert *I,* thus obtaining the familiar phrase *wot I.* Subsequent editors would then alter *wel* to *wol, wool,* in order to satisfy their notion of the line's meaning.

The comparison of grass to velvet occurs in Chaucer's translation of the *Roman de la Rose* line 1420, in Lydgate's *Black Knight* 80, in his *Troy Book* ii: 2450, and occasionally down to Browning's *Red Cotton Nightcap Country;* the comparison to wool I have not noted. French verse also retained the simile; cp. Charles d'Orléans' "tappis velus De vert herbe . . . ." Also, the spelling *welwet, ueluet,* for *velvet,* is too common to need exemplification, though the *Troy Book* ii: 715 may be mentioned. It appears to me, reasoning from the procedure of later editors on one-half the word, that a similar procedure of earlier editors on its other half is possible; and the fact that the two moves destroy a perfectly good contemporary simile and a tolerable scansion, in order to substitute an "infelicity," may be an argument against both.

In preparing an edition of *The Flower and the Leaf,* I have noticed some few other points regarding Professor Skeat's text, which may be mentioned. In line 220 the original text is

> **Came kings of armes and no mo,**

which Skeat marks as an acephalous line. It is however probable from the poem, especially from line 502, that the numeral *nine* has been omitted. If the scribe left space for *ix,* intending to rubric it later, as was often done with numerals, and then overlooked it, it may have thus been lost from the text.

Another point which might be criticised in Professor Skeat's edition is his failure to credit Urry with seventeen of the emendations which he himself makes, and with fifteen attempts at emendation in places where Skeat himself emends. Further, the student of English punctuation, whenever he appears, may be glad to learn from an editor of the text of this poem that the second Speght, in 1602, added some 450 commas to the print of 1598, and seems to have done so with no little care. But the student of punctuation, like the student of metrics and linguistics, becomes bewildered when attempting to trace the expression of the first author through Professor Skeat's insistent emendation of the early printer.

ELEANOR PRESCOTT HAMMOND.

Boston.

Much Ado About Nothing (V. I. 178)

In the midst of a lively description by Don Pedro and Claudio of Beatrice's violently changing moods, Don Pedro sententiously sums up her attitude towards Benedict in the words, 'If she did not hate him *deadly,* she would love him *dearly*'. W. L. Rushton (*Shakespeare's Euphuism,* p. 42) believed this to be one of the passages revealing the influence of *Euphues* upon Shakespeare, and quoted Euphues' words to Lucilla [1] to prove his point: "'Indeed,' said Euphues, 'to know the cause of your alteration would boot me little, seeing the effect taketh such force. I have heard that *women either love entirely or hate deadly,* and seeing you have put me out of doubt of the one, I must needs persuade myself of the other.'"

Beyond the quoting of Rushton's parallel from *Euphues* by Furness, I have not found that this passage in the modern editions of *Much Ado* has elicited comment. However, since Croll called attention to the importance of the proverbial element in *Euphues*,

[1] Croll and Clemons edition 1916, p. 81.

in his edition of this work,[2] a coincidence of thought of this kind suggests that Shakespeare and Lyly were endebted to a common proverbial source. And this proves to be the case. The collection of *sententiae* which formerly passed under the name of *Proverbiae Senecae,* but now attributed to Publilius Syrus, contains the original form of this observation in the words, "Aut amat aut odit mulier: nihil est tertium." [3]

Lyly may have seen the thought in George Pettie's *A Petite Pallace* from which he drew so considerably both for the style of his writing and the content of his proverbial material. We find there in one place [4] that it is "naturally incident to women to enter into extremities; *they are either too loving or too loathing*"; and in another place, the similar thought,[5] with alliterative emphasis as in the Shakespearean example, that "he may think *I love him deeply, though I hate him deadly.*"

Thomas Nash uses the proverb in a notable attack upon women in his *Anatomy of Absurdity:* "Seneca also saith this in his Proverbs: Aut amat, aut odit mulier, nil tertium est . . . *A woman either loves, or hates,* there is no third thing." [6] The dramatists of the time with their fondness for the packed thought employ this observation of the ancients. The play, "*Rare Triumphs*" has it: [7] "*Penulo.* A right woman, *either love like an angel or hate like a devil;* extremes so do well." George Chapman, also, with his characteristic love for the sententious wisdom of the classics, employs it: [8] "Who would be cumbered with these soft-hearted creatures, that are ever in extremes, *either too kind or too unkind?*"

The English proverbial collections begin to record this proverbial thought in the seventeenth century. John Clarke, in parallel columns in his *Paraemiologia Anglo-Latina,* 1639, p. 118, under "Feminae" gives the English form, "Women are always in extremes"; and beside it the Latin counterpart, "Mulier vel odit aut amat, non datur tertium." And Giovanni Torriano in his *Commonplace of Italian Proverbs and Proverbial Phrases,* 1666, p. 75, no. 29, has, "La donna ô ama, ô odia, *a woman either loves or hates.*"

Shakespeare's fondness for gnomic material was shared generally by the writers of his day; and it is likely that when we know the sixteenth century proverbs better than we do now, that a number of resemblances of thought now considered to show the influence upon Shakespeare of a predecessor, or his influence upon a con-

[2] *Euphues,* 1916, p. vii and p. 14, note 4.
[3] *Sentences de Publilius Syrus,* Paris, 1835, p. 28.
[4] Gollanz edition, *Chatto and Windus,* 1908, I, p. 47.
[5] *Ibidem,* I, p. 118.
[6] *Thomas Nash* (Mckerrow, I, p. 15, line 12.)
[7] *Rare Triumphs,* Dodsley's *Old Plays* (Hazlitt), VII, 359.
[8] *May-Day,* in *Comedies of George Chapman* (Parrott), p. 173 (I, i. 327).

temporary or a successor, may be seen to be, not the influence of the one writer upon the other, but to be the independent use by both, after the literary manner of the day, of some classical or vernacular proverbial thought.

M. T. TILLEY.

Ann Arbor, Michigan.

OTHER "PORTMANTEAU" WORDS

Despite the MS. note on *tomax* in the Harvard pamphlet of 1761, and the entry under that word in the *NED.*, Professor Emerson (*MLN.*, June, 1923, p. 378 f.) cites the "later entry" of the *NED.*, and other authorities, in support of his conclusion that it is not a "conscious telescoping of two others, as in the 'portmanteau' variety of Lewis Carroll," but "rather a folk-etymology, or unconscious influence of meaning upon form, doubtless due to the earlier pronunciation of *tomahawk* as *tomahack,* of which *tom'hack* would be a natural abbreviation if not an original form." He notes its use by Dr. Johnson in 1759, and by others.

The packing of two meanings into one word is, however, not unrelated to "folk-etymology," and it antedates 1759. In 1709, Swift published a "Tritical Essay upon the Faculties of the Mind," and the *NED.* derives the word from *trite,* with a play on *critical.* The editor notes the use of it, and its derivitatives *tritically, triticalness, triticality,* and *triticism* ("after *criticism;* cf. also *witticism*") in Sterne, Pope, D'Israeli, Carlyle, Scott, and the *Contemporary Review* (1869). The pronunciation of the first syllable as in *trite,* would bring out the "portmanteau" quality of the word clearly.[1]

In more modern times—although it would be impossible to trace the influence of Lewis Carroll directly—we have other "portmanteau" words. Professor Kittredge (in *Words and Their Ways*) has noted *electrocute,* made up of *electric* and the final syllable of *execute,* which, in the popular mind, was connected with the idea of "killing by due process of law." If we call a "'cute" child "killing," the only process of law involved is the law of human nature; and there is, as Professor Kittredge has pointed out, nothing in the syllable *-cute* to justify any such force as it assumes when used as a suffix, as above. Then there is the word *brunch,* heard in New England colleges, and also at Cambridge, England, to describe the simple meal which comes, often on Sunday morning, too late for breakfast and too early for lunch. As far as I have been able to discover, neither of these words is recorded in the *NED.* The former is surely an "Americanism," and the latter may have been so, originally.

These "portmanteau" words are not merely the joining of two words, or parts of words, or of a word with prefix or suffix—well-

[1] Neither *tomax* nor *tritical* is included in Johnson's *Dictionary* (1755).

known linguistic phenomena—but the joining of two words with enough of each to make, as it were, a double exposure on the film of the mind, and bring the ideas behind each of the words simultaneously before the hearer. *Blog,* an uncomplimentary English epithet, made up of *bloody* and *dog,* is also not to be found in the *NED.,* and probably not in any other polite society; *slantindicular,* a humorous compound of *slantin'* and *perpendicular,* is recorded by Mr. Kittredge (in *Words and Their Ways*), but it has hardly gained wide currency. *Fieldsome* (used in an editorial in the Boston *Transcript* of 4 August, 1908), means "fond of the out-of-doors," (as opposed to the more businesslike "athletic"); it is obviously formed from *field* and the suffix *-some,* as in *handsome:* it combines, rather than telescopes, as does such a form as *high-brow,* and neither of these words could be called a "portmanteau" word, though they pack two meanings into one combination.

Mr. M. D. Follin has recorded (*Notes and Queries,* s. 13, vol. 2 [vol. CXLVI, p. 287] for 19 April, 1924) the combination *motor-cade,* from Florida, coined to describe a procession of motorcars. It is obviously from *motor* and the last syllable of *cavalcade;* and ingenious as such a newspaper coinage is, it belongs rather with Mr. Kittredge's *gasolier* (from *gas* and the last syllable of *chandelier*) than with the "portmanteau" words. *-Cute, -cade,* and *-lier* are not suffixes; but it is clear from what words they come; whereas *slithy* and *brunch* rather suggest than indicate their component parts.

Is Swift the originator of "portmanteau" words, although it was Lewis Carroll who gave them the name? Is not the practice, in its earlier stages, that of adding words to suffixes, or what were felt to be suffixes, and so developing new words? The psychological effect of words that we now feel to be "portmanteau" words is really that of a good pun, in that both present two ideas simultaneously; and it is perhaps for this reason that nowadays the "portmanteau" word seems a little *infra dig.,* and to be avoided when one is writing seriously, as one would avoid a neologism or a colloquial phrase. It is thought to be the fashion to decry puns, just now, and there are teachers who apologize for those of Shakspere. If the "portmanteau" word has not attained that distinction, it is, perhaps, due to the fact that it is not so common.

Smith College. ROBERT WITHINGTON.

VOLTAIRE'S VERSES AGAINST LOUIS RACINE'S *De La Grâce*

Louis Racine's poem *De La Grâce,* published in 1722, was the occasion of severe religious quarrels, even before it had appeared in print.[1] Among the authors who attacked the youthful

[1] A notice in the *Mém. His. et Crit.* of Jan. 15, 1722, reveals that L.

poet was Voltaire, whose well-known poem accuses Racine of faithlessness to the church.[2] The dates of the writing and the publication of Voltaire's epigram have never been known. Beuchot inferred that it was written toward the end of 1722, the year of Racine's poem.[3] Both Beuchot and Bengesco give the date of the publication as 1724.[4] As a matter of fact the poem was written either very early in 1722, or perhaps late in the preceding year, for it occurs in an apparently hitherto unnoticed form in the *Mémoires Historiques et Critiques* of January 30, 1722 (p. 86). The author of the notice which accompanies this earliest version of the poem expresses great surprise that Voltaire, "l'auteur de tant de petites pièces plus qu'enjouées" should concern himself with religious matters and surmises that "il pourrait bien y avoir dans cette conduite plus de jalousie poétique que de zèle pour la doctrine de l'église."

Comparison of the version of 1722 with that of 1724 shows that Voltaire slightly softened the tone of his epigram, and made it less personal. The poem as found in the *Mémoires* is as follows, the variants being indicated:

> Cher Racine, j'ai lu dans tes vers *dogmatiques*
> De ton Jansénius les leçons fanatiques.
> Quelquefois je t'admire, et ne te crois en rien.
> Si ton style me plaît, ton Dieu n'est pas le mien:
> Tu m'en fais un tyran: je veux qu'il soit *mon* père;
> Ton hommage est forcé, *le mien* est volontaire;
> *De son sang mieux que toi* je reconnais le prix;
> Tu le sers en esclave, et je l'adore en fils.
> Crois-moi, n'affecte *point* une inutile audace;
> Il faut comprendre Dieu pour comprendre sa grâce.
> Soumettons nos esprits, présentons-lui nos cœurs,
> Et soyons des chrétiens, et non pas des docteurs.[5]

GEO. B. WATTS.

University of Minnesota.

BRIEF MENTION

The Old English Andreas and Bishop Acca of Hexham, by Albert Stanburrough Cook. (Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, Vol. 26, pp. 245-332, June, 1924).

Racine had made public bits of verse which gave indications as to the nature of the forthcoming poem.

[2] Voltaire, *Oeuvres* (Moland), x, 479.

[3] *Idem.*

[4] *Idem* and Bengesco, *Bibl. des Oeuv. de Volt.* I, 263.

[5] The British Museum lists an edition of *Sur la Grâce*, Paris, 1720, in-8. Cf. Vapereau, *Dict. litt.*, p. 1690, and Lanson, *Man. Bibl.*, p. 648. The bibliography of L. Racine's early works will be the subject of a later note.

The admirable scholarship of Professor Cook's discussion of the authorship of *Andreas* does not lead to a final answer to this troubled question, nor indeed was it expected to do so. From the nature of the case one is dealing here with probabilities, not with absolute demonstrations, and Professor Cook does make it extremely probable that *Andreas* was composed by Bishop Acca. But the final value of a thorough study like this consists not in the determination of an objective fact, a date, a place, or a title of authorship. It lies rather in restoring to consciousness the life of a past period in a way which begets confidence in the truthfulness of the restoration. This is what Professor Cook succeeds in doing. He makes one realize, not baldly but circumstantially, the background of English ecclesiastical and literary life in the eighth century. If he does not succeed in definitely proving that Acca of Hexham wrote *Andreas,* one does not for that reason lay his study down with any sense of disappointment. On the contrary, one places it among that small collection of books to which the student intent on understanding the life and literary activity of the Anglo-Saxon period must constantly turn.

G. P. K.

Die Zelle der deutschen Mundart, von Eduard Kück (Hamburg, F. W. Rademacher, 1924. 83 S., mit Karte). Die Dialektforschungen der letzten Jahrzehnte haben ergeben, dass die Grenzen der heutigen Mundarten ziemlich genau übereinstimmen mit den politischen Grenzen des ausgehenden Mittelalters. In dieser Monographie beschäftigt sich Kück nun mit der Frage, ob es nicht möglich sei, weiter in das Altertum der Sprache zurückzudringen und kleinere Einheiten (Zellen) festzulegen. Eine Untersuchung der Gaugeschichte sowohl als der Dialekte hat gezeigt, dass die engeren mundartlichen Grenzen in der Nähe Harburgs (südlich von Hamburg) genau zusammenfallen mit denen der altertümlichen Mark- bzw. Holzgenossenschaften, d. h. die Dorfgruppen, die an ein und demselben Walde einen Holzanteil hatten. Besonders klar liegen die Verhältnisse bei dem Hollenstedter Kreis, der sich durch die "zerdehnten" oder "verbreiterten" Vokale scharf trennt von den weiter östlich und südlich gelegenen Ortschaften im Regierungsbezirke Lüneburg. In Hollenstedt finden wir z. B. e·i, o·u gegen scharf akzentuiertes ē, ō in Tostedt und Umgebung (kre·igel ro·uk gegen krēgel, rōk). Im ganzen schält Kück vier alte Markgenossenschaften (Zellen) heraus: Hollenstedt, der Tot, Brumhagen, Stuvenwald, welche jetzt alle auf verschiedene Kirchspiele verteilt sind. Die Ortschaften, welche in alter Zeit zusammengehört hatten, zeigen aber noch heute eine Sprachgemeinschaft, Übereinstimmung der Sitten und Verschwäg-

erung trotz Neuerungen, die die alten Genossenschaften zerrissen und die Dörfer diesem oder jenem Amt oder Kirchspiel zugeteilt haben. Erstaunlich ist die Zähigkeit des Dialekts auch gegenüber Einwanderung fremder Elemente. Die Volkszählung von 1870 ergab in den drei Dörfern Hollenstedt, Emmen, Wohlesbostel 45% Fremde und dennoch hat der alte Dialekt nichts von seiner Eigenart eingebüsst. Bei Einpfarrung eines Dorfes mit Ansiedelungen einer anderen Genossenschaft dringen zwar einige Neuerungen ein. Ochtmannsbruch, das zur Holzgenossenschaft Tostedt gehört, ist nach Hollenstedt eingepfarrt und die Kinder gehen auch dort zur Schule. Im Tot(bewaldeter Höhenrücken) spricht man für "eher" e·ir, in Hollenstedt īr. Diese Form hat in Ochtmannsbruch jene verdrängt. Unbeschadet solcher Fälle von Neuerung und Abbröckelung der Mundart an den Grenzen hat Kück den Beweis geliefert, dass hier tatsächlich die Dialektgrenzen ungefähr zusammenfallen mit denen der alten Markgenossenschaften und nicht den viel späteren politischen. Seine Methode scheint für die Dialektforschung vielen Gewinn zu versprechen, wenn man auch bezweifeln darf, ob Schlüsse auf die Stammesangehörigkeit der ersten Ansiedler gestattet sind. Es wäre äusserst wünschenswert, dass in anderen Gegenden ähnliche Studien angestellt würden.

T. S.

Students of Romance philology will welcome the appearance of the *Bibliographie* for 1909 by Dr. Franz Ritter which has recently appeared (1923) as *Supplementheft* XXXIV, attached to the volume of the *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* for 1910. The fact that the bibliography may be purchased separately (Halle, Niemeyer, M. 8), will prove advantageous for those to whom the present greatly increased price of the *Zeitschrift* as a whole is prohibitive. The joy with which the new list is greeted is tempered by the fact that it is thirteen years in arrears, instead of three years, as was the case when the bibliography for 1908 appeared in 1912. We are promised, however, that the intervening years will be speedily treated in the *Kritischer Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der Romanischen Philologie,* with which the Bibliography of the *Zeitschrift* is in the future to be united, under the editorship of Professor Hilka, the editor of the *Zeitschrift.* This news will be received with general satisfaction.

As the Bibliography is thus defunct with the present issue, there is little use in detailed criticism of it. It follows the excellent general plan of previous years, being slightly enlarged. Greater care in the arrangement and revision of the material might have been of use. Misprints are regrettably frequent.

D. S. B.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XL | APRIL, 1925 | NUMBER 4

DEFINING ROMANTICISM: A SURVEY AND A PROGRAM [1]

No more persistent problem forces itself upon the student of literature and the historian of thought at the present time than the interpretation of the term romanticism. Arising for the first time at the end of the eighteenth century as a critical token needed to represent new modes of expression and the impulses behind them in many areas of human interest, it has come to express an increasing and bewildering number of phenomena, often of the most widely diverging and even opposing categories. A generation ago, in 1890, Brunetière declared, "Le mot de *romantisme,* après cinquante ans et plus de discussions passionées, ne laisse pas d'être encore aujourd'hui bien vague et bien flottant." [2] During the years which have elapsed since his utterance the manifold phenomena which might conceivably be comprehended under the term have constituted one of principal objects of persistent research and criticism. Definition and interpretation of romanticism have been an engrossing concern of the literary world. But apparently we are no nearer agreement in our views than were Brunetière's contemporaries. In fact, after another generation of frustrated effort we echo even more feelingly his words:—"bien vague et flottant." Our predicament—and shall we conclude at least a partial explanation thereof?—is all too signifi-

[1] The substance of this paper was presented before the Group for the Critical Study of Romanticism of the Modern Language Association of America at the meeting of the Association in 1923. After the paper was formally prepared for publication Professor A. O. Lovejoy's brilliant and comprehensive analysis of the same problem, "On the Discrimination of Romanticisms," appeared in the *PMLA*, XXXIX (1924), pp. 229-253.

[2] *Études critiques*, III, p. 294.

cantly epitomized in the title of a recent book, *Random Studies in the Romantic Chaos.*[3]

A survey of the latest formulas proposed, moreover, indicates that the number of widely diverging views is not being reduced but actually increased. Professor P. R. Frye, for example, defines romanticism as anything which "tends to disrupt or disturb the balance of the faculties."[4] Professor Oliver Elton though loath "to add to the wreckage of definitions," suggests that the romanticist "surrenders himself, as the classical writer does not, to the emotion or passion to which the creature of his dreams is also surrendered. . . . Like the mystic he tries to become the object desired in his own vision."[5] Professor H. J. C. Grierson "is tempted at times to cut the knot of resolving the problem into one of form alone . . . . the essence of Romantic art" being "that in it the spirit counts for more than the form."[6] Mr. J. Middleton Murry finds little difference between realism and romanticism,[7] a view which seems to be shared by the late Sir Walter Raleigh when he avers that "Wordsworth, like Defoe, drew straight from the life."[8] The most novel as well as the most vague is Professor J. G. Robertson's suggestion that "Romanticism in all lands stands for a conciliation of life and poetry."[9] Such are the more noteworthy new contributions to the interpretation.[10]

[3] By F. A. Waterhouse, 1923.

[4] Chap. on "The Terms Classic and Romantic," in *Romance and Tragedy*, 1922, pp. 338-39.

[5] "Poetic Romancers After 1850," Brit. Acad. Warton Lecture, 1914; reprinted in *A Sheaf of Papers*, 1922, p. 62.

[6] *Classical and Romantic*, Leslie Stephen Lecture, May 3, 1923 (Cambridge Press, 1923).

[7] *The Problem of Style*, 1922, p. 31. Cf. the long note on the passage, p. 146.

[8] *Romance*, 1916, p. 33.

[9] "New Interpretations of Romanticism," in the periodical *Discovery*, London, I, 1920, p. 334.

[10] I have tried to assemble the representative definitions of English and American writers of the past few years in order to reflect adequately, in summary form, contemporary opinion. The chapter on "Romantic Fallacies" in W. P. Ker's *The Art of Poetry*, 1923, pp. 73-92, yields no interpretation except the suggestion that romanticism is "the fairy way of writing" (p. 79). The short discussion of the term romantic by Robert Bridges in S. P. E. Tract No. xv, 1923, attempts no contribution which concerns us here.

Other recent definitions repeat the well known view that romanticism is the effort to "escape from reality,"[11] "extraordinary development of imaginative sensibility,"[12] or the expression of the impulsive, "expansive" desires of human nature.[13]

To this pass—or shall we say impasse?—have we come after a generation of research and analysis. The welter of varying and irreconcilably opposing interpretations holds no hope for agreement among any considerable number of students of the problem. Are we then pursuing a will-o'-the-wisp? Is this the Proteus of the history of literature and indeed of the history of thought, which will never yield its true form and pressure?

There are some who are returning an emphatic affirmative to these questions, and, professedly convinced of the futility of further effort, are openly bidding us give over the quest. Professor E. D. Snyder speaks with bold assurance of "the wholesome tendency of modern scholarship to stop attempting a definition of romanticism."[14] For Sir Walter Raleigh "there are only two schools of literature—the good and the bad. . . No single formula can hope to describe two eras, or define two tempers of mind.[15] And in genial vein, but still quite seriously, it would seem, Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch has recently remarked "that it may help our minds to earn an honest living if we dismiss the terms 'classical' and 'romantic' out of our vocabulary for a while . . . the whole pother about their difference amounts to nothing that need trouble a healthy man."[16] Many of us will protest against these expressions, which are in effect the counsels of despair. Yet we

[11] "The fundamental characteristic of the true romanticist is an intense dislike of immediate actuality, whether of time or place." Waterhouse, *op. cit.*, p. 145.

[12] C. H. Herford, *The Age of Wordsworth*, 1920, p. xiv; see also "Romanticism in the Modern World," in *Essays and Studies* by Members of the English Association, VIII, pp. 123-24.

[13] Professor Irving Babbitt will be at once identified as the most vigorous spokesman of this interpretation. See *Rousseau and Romanticism*, 1919, *passim*.

[14] *The Celtic Revival in English Literature, 1760-1800*, 1923, opening sentence of the preface.

[15] *Op. cit.*, p. 36.

[16] *Studies in Literature*, First Series, chap. on "'Classical' and 'Romantic,'" 1923, pp. 87, 89.

must recognize them as voicing an apparently growing body of opinion.[17]

Both the extreme diversity of view and the frank conviction of the futility of further effort have now created a crisis in the history of the problem. The situation—which we must all realize is intolerable—cannot honestly be evaded. Three courses, then, let us say, are open to us: 1. We can abandon the effort as hopeless. 2. We can continue to drift in the present aimless course, accumulating further "random studies in the romantic chaos," vaguely trusting that we may somehow "muddle through." 3. Or we can lay out a new systematic plan of campaign: scrutinizing afresh the terms we are accustomed to use in our formulations; analyzing the different applications of the "romantic" to the different fields so described, such as the aesthetic, the psychological, the ethical, the social; achieving thereby finer and clearer distinctions; and so preparing the way for the possibility of some common agreement.

If we give up the terms we shall plunge ourselves into a "chaos" which will not be less chaotic merely because it is not labeled "romantic." We must use *some* terms or stop thinking. If not these then what? After all, we have built up meanings and an elaborate fabric of associations around "classical" and "romantic"; we do know what the other scholar means even if we do not accept his view; and most of us are in really encouraging accord as to classicism and even realism. These are advantages not to be lightly cast away. To throw aside the words in favor of unknown substitutes—which may prove confusion worse confounded—is critical suicide. 'Tis better to "bear the ills we have than fly to others that we know not of!"

If, on the other hand, we continue in the present random course we have no reason to suppose that we shall be able to construct a solid causeway across the warring elements to a firm ground of

[17] With increasing frequency one hears the vigorously expressed conviction that further attempt to define romanticism is futile, and that we should profit by disregarding the term. I heard this view frankly and almost unanimously voiced in a conversation of a group of scholars at a recent meeting of the Modern Language Association. I was unable to discover, however, what they propose to substitute.

understanding. On the contrary, it seems to me that we convict ourselves of the very methods or lack of methods which we associate with ancient and medieval pursuit of knowledge. I mean that up to the present we simply have not attempted to organize our information and opinions within the field covered by romanticism in any systematic way. We have not ordered the facts in question and after proper analysis reduced them to rational, workable syntheses. We have either studied a small section of the field intensively, one writer or one tendency, or we have speculated broadly on the basis of totally insufficient data. From the continuance of such a course we must not expect satisfactory generalization or reconciliation of opposing views.

Every aspect of this situation, therefore, demands a renovated plan of attack. Our only hope lies in a new program which will entail a far more vigorous, patient, and sweeping procedure than hitherto attempted. To indicate the outline of such a program is my present concern.

As an obviously essential first step I should propose a systematic and reasonably exhaustive inventory of the definitions and interpretations of romanticism which have been proposed in various languages. Up to the present the various surveys have included only the more prominent representative views. No one, apparently has thought it worth while to assemble all the interpretations. Yet such a collection must be made once and for all if we are to have any sound scholarly basis for study. We cannot make an intelligent choice or a new synthesis until all the phenomena are before us.[18]

[18] The extraordinarily slight attention given to the historical investigation of the terms is illustrated by the fact that John Foster's pioneer essay "On the Application of the Epithet Romantic" of 1805 has been almost completely overlooked for more than a century. Cf. my article in *MLN*, 1923, XXXVIII, pp. 1-14, in which I show that this essay for the first time in English and indeed more fully than in any discussion in any language up to the time, endows the word romantic with rich content, establishing many of the critical meanings afterward developed.

Professor Lovejoy has rendered notable service in his thorough investigation of the early critical meanings of the word in German. See his articles, "On the Meaning of 'Romantic' in Early German Romanticism," *MLN*, 1916 (XXXI), 385-396; 1917 (XXXII), 65-77; and "Schiller and the Genesis of Romanticism," *MLN*, 1920 (XXXV), 1-10.

Almost necessarily involved in this process of compilation is the attendant preparation of a reasonably exhaustive bibliography of interpretations. All bibliographies up to the present are highly selective and generally apply to only one literature. The need for a far more comprehensive list of titles is obvious.

Closely related to this initial task is a thorough historical investigation of the various terms involved, particularly, of course, the word "romantic," apart from critical definition or evaluation. This study will inevitably lead us to the center of one of our principal cruxes, the careless identification of romance and romanticism and the resulting confusion of terms and ideas. The source of our difficulty here is the unfortunate two-fold burden which is imposed upon "romantic" when it serves as the adjective for both romance and romanticism. Consequently, I would suggest that for the adjectival form of romanticism we use the word *romanticistic*.[19] In any case, we must face the present ambiguity of "romantic" and avoid this confusion in terminology. To this end, as indeed to the essential but hitherto impossible understanding of the widening content of "romantic," we shall be greatly assisted by the historical study of the word.

When such materials are made accessible, and not until then, we shall be adequately prepared to attack the difficulties of framing a satisfactory definition. But the nature of these difficulties, also, should be stated as clearly as possible; and the next essential step in the program here proposed, accordingly, is an analysis of them. Among these difficulties the principal ones seem to me to be the following:

1. The relation of romance and romanticism, represented, as just indicated, by the dual rôle of the adjective "romantic." I find no clear-sighted recognition of this question. When we turn to a volume called *Essays in Romantic Literature* we have at the present time no idea what sort of subject will be treated. As a matter of fact a collection of studies by that name[20] contains

[19] The *N.E.D.* cites two examples of the use of this word: *Harper's Magazine*, Sept., 1889, p. 641; and *The Century Magazine*, July, 1895, p. 418. Cf. the French *romanesque* and *romantique*. "Sentimental," also, is ambiguous in a similar way. It would seem that we should use "sentimentalistic" as the adjective for sentimentalism.

[20] By George Wyndham, 1919.

chapters on "The Springs of Romance in the Literature of Europe," "Ronsard and the Pleïade," "North's Plutarch," and "Sir Walter Scott." Professor Frye's volume *Romance and Tragedy* contains a chapter on "The Terms Classic and Romantic." Sir Walter Raleigh's two lectures in the little book *Romance* discusses medieval romance and later transformations of the "romantic," as for example in the period which we call the Romantic Movement. These three examples will serve to illustrate a widespread tendency to equate romance with romanticism, or at least partially, by means of some common denominator. Now this view may be correct. Perhaps they are fundamentally the same, as Professor Grierson, for example, would have us believe in their "transcendence of reason."[21] But more commonly we hold that at the end of the eighteenth century certain points of view arose at least in developed forms which constitute a new movement quite different from anything in the Middle Ages.[22] The question is, Are romance,—ancient, medieval, or modern—and romanticism the same in certain essential qualities? How do they differ?[23]

[21] *Op. cit.*, p. 59.

[22] Heine and Beers, I suppose we all now agree, confused certain external and more or less accidental manifestations or earlier romance, as revived at the time of the Romantic Movement, with the profound changes which were pervading the whole thought of Europe.

[23] The loose, undefined—and, it is to be feared, often unconsidered—uses of romantic, romance, etc., in the criticism of our best writers shows the necessity of a thorough overhauling of the terms and the most cautious qualifications in their usage. Mr. J. Middleton Murry, one of the most accomplished contemporary critics, remarks that "Shakespeare was essentially a Romantic writer." He declares also that "All great writers since Rousseau have been romantic." This would include Burns, Landor, Arnold, and Hardy, as I presume he would admit. Truly, then, romantic is a term of almost infinite elasticity.

One prolific cause of confusion is the different senses of romance. The word stands for a type of literature which is by no means satisfactorily defined even yet. (See a recent discussion, "The Definition of Romance," N. E. Griffin, *PMLA*, XXXVIII (1923), pp. 50-70). It means also the attitude toward experience animating such a form of literature, however that attitude may be characterized. If we cite also the more popular senses of love affair or love story, and remind ourselves that the adjective romantic is applied to all these uses, the cause of confusion is clear. And when the adjective has to do duty for romanticism we cannot wonder that the strain upon it becomes intolerable.

2. The failure to denote in defining romanticism whether we refer to form, content, or temper, or to more than one of these elements. Here again I have found no clear-cut statement of such an approach to our problem. Most definitions have assumed temper or animating point of view to be the center of interest, but by no means all. Many of the contrasting qualities which we draw up in our columns headed respectively "classical" and "romantic" are those which describe form and content. Oftentimes it is not easy or perhaps possible to characterize the three elements separately, for we are dealing with the fundamental subtleties of art. But we can and must make clear to ourselves what aspect of art we are describing in our definitions, and so distinguish the various manifestations of the controlling purpose which in essential quality or qualities we regard as romantic. In this way we shall recognize the nature of one principal source of our confusion.

3. The fundamental question, growing out of the preceding, as to the fields of human interest in which we shall decide romanticism is a proper descriptive term. That is, shall we confine the problem, so far as possible to the field of aesthetics, as Pater did when he made his famous characterization of "strangeness added to beauty?" Or shall romanticism be described in psychological terms, as "the recovery of imaginative power" or "the predominance of imagination over reason and the sense of fact?" Shall we extend the jurisdiction to the ethical realm and regard romanticism as the assertion of the individual self or the escape from reality? Or is this to be regarded *au fond* as a philosophical conception according to which romanticism is the immersion of man in the flux of nature.[24] Are we justified in extending the term to the social and political spheres also, regarding the theory of individualism and the democratic urge as expressions of romanticism?[25] Is there, finally, something fundamental in human

[24] The view to which Mr. Paul Elmer More has given prominence. See his *Drift of Romanticism*, 1913, p. xiii, and references to this interpretation below.

[25] There has been a marked tendency during the last few years to regard the rise and development of the democratic movement as a manifestation of romanticism. But we should not forget that some critics such as William Dean Howells have claimed romanticism as aristocratic and monarchical in spirit. Cf. his *Modern Italian Poets*, 1887, p. 133.

nature which expresses itself in all these fields, something which may be variously defined as the spirit of waywardness, of rebellion against restraints, as the élan vital? To use the usual antithesis, are "classical and romantic......the systole and diastole of the human heart is history?"[26] Or will it be more satisfactory to define romanticism as the expression of certain points of view which develop only in medieval or modern times? These are, in most summary form, the questions concerning the range of human thought and activity to be comprehended within the term romanticism.

If we decided finally that romantic is the best word to denote some universal tendency of human nature—however we may agree to define it—then we may call the expressions of this tendency, in the various fields of thought romanticism. I cannot believe, however, that we are in a position yet to make such a decision; and surely it should not be made until we become convinced that we can use no less ambiguous term. At present the word has firmly established popular and literary meanings[27] which we would not change even if we could. But when, to cite an outstanding instance, we use it to describe "the dominant tendency and admitted ideal"[28] of the past century and a half we immediately and arbitrarily cause it to assume the burden of describing some fundamental impulse. Thus used by the neo-humanists romantic is not

[26] Grierson, *op. cit.*, p. 55. Stated in such terms, perhaps we should include this conception within the psychological category.

[27] From the beginning of the critical uses of romantic the word has been co-extensive with anti-classical (or anti-neo-classical). It has thus come to assume any or all of the meanings which could be ranged under this head. Applied specifically, for instance, it means nothing positive by itself alone. Thus if we use the phrase "classical elements in Elizabethan criticism," we know at once what such elements are; while if we say "romantic elements," all we know is that they are not classical, and we must specifically state what elements we refer to. For this reason the use of such terminology in characterizing aspects of formal criticism appears to me unfortunately obscure. It were much clearer to employ "anti-classical" in place of "romantic." To take a recent example, the title of J. G. Robertson's learned work, *Studies in the Genesis of Romantic Theory in the Eighteenth Century* (1923) does not convey the idea of any single unmistakable doctrine. What the author means is "The Genesis of the Romantic Theory of the Enthronement of the Imagination." See n. 29 below.

[28] P. E. More, *op. cit.*, p. xii.

only a term of definition; it is a term of evaluation. They have broadened its application, it would seem, because of its conveniently derogatory meaning of illusory, unsound, and by this use they condemn in advance what they believe to be the unwholesome tendencies of modern civilization. I do not pretend to say whether or not this interpretation is justified. I am merely contending that we have not as yet studied all the facts with sufficient thoroughness to warrant such sweeping use of our term.

These three related difficulties must be systematically analyzed if we are to make progress toward a scholarly agreement about the meaning of romanticism. Inevitably, moreover, we shall have to subject to fresh scrutiny certain of the words habitually used in existing definitions. It will not be quibbling to inquire what sort of "imagination"[29] we are thinking of nor need we be diverted into endless metaphysical altercation if we ask what we mean by "escape from reality."[30] These considerations merely emphasize the fundamental significance of our general inquiry.

As almost an inevitable step in such a program as here outlined there is furthermore involved a nicer discrimination of the qualities of those writers who are now commonly characterized as romantic. We all feel that the word may serve well enough as a general term of historical and categorical designation in a college catalogue or text-book. But granting that Wordsworth, Shelley, and Byron for example may be so described as representing a reaction against neo-classical standards, we realize that they differ from each other almost as much as they do from neo-classicism itself.[31] We realize that these poets as well as other writers manifest distinctly classical and realistic as well as romantic traits at different times and even in the same poem. What we need to achieve therefore is the analysis and properly systematic discrimination of these strains. Such a clarification will contribute incal-

[29] No problem related to our inquiry is more crucial, perhaps, than the definition of imagination. It makes all the difference whether this faculty is of the type which perceives uniformity or diversity. We need far more thorough analysis of the types before we can assert mere ascendency or predominance of imagination to be the essential quality of romanticism.

[30] So frequently is romanticism envisaged as escape from reality and also as realization of "higher" or "deeper" reality, that it would seem desirable to make sure that we agree on the meaning of this word!

[31] Cf. n. 27 above.

culably to the adequate appreciation of these, or, obviously, of any authors. This is merely a commonplace statement of the "whole duty of criticism," but in view of the loosely applied description of "romantic poets," we need to reemphasize the ideal. If we can approximate more closely to it through these finer and more exhaustively developed discriminations our effort, though not resulting in a satisfactory definition of romanticism itself, will yield results of high significance.

The plan of campaign, to summarize, entails the preparation of apparatus in the form of adequate compilation of definitions and uses of the disputed terms, with a study of their historical relations, and the assembling of a corresponding critical bibliography; the thorough analysis of the existing confusion and diversity of definitions, with recognition of the relations between romance and romanticism, of the neglected problem of form, content, and temper, and of the problem of defining in universal terms of human nature or of circumscribing within certain fields of interest; and the finer discrimination of the diverse elements in the writing to which the terms have been applied.

Of necessity such a program cannot be limited to one literature, If there is any area in which the comparative method is essential, it is here. We must, of course, make thorough comparisons between the related manifestations termed romantic in various literatures, and we must study the proposed definitions and interpretations of romanticism in French and German particularly, as well as in English. Should we not go even further, however, and extend our inquiry into the nature of the phenomena called romantic in other arts? One makes the suggestion with diffidence, for it will be objected that we have quite enough to engage us if we confine our study to literature alone.[32] But such a provocative sketch as W. E. Henley's "Note on Romanticism"[33] reveals what significant results are made possible in the field of "comparative art," and points the way to at least tentative generalizations. Though by such widening of the inquiry we at first complicate our problem it may well be that in return we shall derive exactly the

[32] The study of the drama, for example, takes us inevitably into the realms of other arts.

[33] In *Views and Reviews—Art*, 1902, brilliant observations which should be better known among students of literature.

illumination we need from the accepted descriptions of related phenomena in other arts.[34] In any case we shall by this larger comparative method provide an example of correlating the arts in a systematic fashion which we all recognize as admirable in theory but which we as yet so little observe.

To those who believe that the multifarious characterizations of romanticism reflect the differences of many minds and that definitions satisfactory to even a majority of students is therefore inherently impossible, the concerted and systematic program which I have outlined will appear quite nugatory. But it must be remembered I am not suggesting the possibility of agreement in evaluation (which must follow the principle of *quot homines tot sententiae*), but in definition. So unless we are prepared to believe that we have based existing definitions on sufficiently comprehensive study of the facts,—which I have tried to show is not the case—we are bound to make some more thorough effort. The nature of this effort I have here indicated with the aim of bringing together, in simple summary for once, the present status of the problem, the difficulties and the issues and of suggesting a *modus operandi.* Our present *laissez-faire* attitude toward the problem is demoralizing to criticism. If the situation is inevitable, we should accept it as such, but only after full consideration of all the facts involved. If there is chance for clarification of the vexed term, no effort to define it can be too arduous. For "romanticism" is omnipresent; we cannot speak of literature and other arts without employing it as a term to denote fundamental expressions of life. If, therefore, we can make even some contribution toward a common understanding of it, we may be rendering the greatest service which criticism can render to an age of wayward and troubled thought.[35]

American University. PAUL KAUFMAN.

[34] Because the aspects of the plastic arts are immediately perceptible to the eye, the qualities often stand out with greater clearness than do the qualities of literature. Moreover, in painting, for example, the distinguishing qualities of the various modes of expression are pretty definitely agreed upon.

[35] No one who has grappled with this problem will minimize the magnitude of the difficulties involved. It may require the patient, united efforts of many students before we can reach a working agreement. Indeed the task would seem to demand some kind of coöperative labor. But before we declare the undertaking hopeless the importance of the cause demands some concerted, systematic effort.

SOME SOURCES OF FLAUBERT'S *SMARH*

This curious production, which occupies slightly over a hundred pages of the second volume of *Oeuvres de jeunesse inédites* (Conard edition), bears the title *Smarh, Vieux mystère,* and the epigraph " La mère en permettra la lecture à sa fille." It was begun late in 1838 as is proved by letters of December 26, 1838, and February 24, 1839 (*Corr.* I. pp. 38, 44) and completed in April of the latter year, according to the date of the manuscript given in the Conard edition. Flaubert was then in his eighteenth year. He had published only two short contributions, in *Le Colibri* of Rouen, one fantastic story and one realistic sketch,[1] but he had tried his hand at almost all literary forms except verse and was consequently no novice at composition.

To the student of Flaubert's literary development *Smarh* has an interest greater than its intrinsic worth would justify. It represents a stage of the long process from a queer production called *Voyage en enfer,* composed about 1835, to the final version of the *Tentation de St. Antoine,* completed in 1872. He returned to the theme first in 1838 with *Agonies* and *la Danse des morts,* now in 1839 with *Smarh,* and again in 1849 with the first version of the *Tentation.* Present day studies of Flaubert tend to regard as his most spontaneous production, not *Madame Bovary* nor *l'Education sentimentale,* in which are embodied the realist's tables of the law, but *Salammbô* and the three versions of the *Tentation. Smarh* is therefore important, if for no other reason, as one stage of the *St. Antoine* idea.

Critics admit generally now an early date for the genesis of the *Tentation* idea. It had been assumed that Flaubert's interest in the saint as the centre of a drama dated from his visit to Genoa in 1845. There he saw Breughel's painting, wrote of it in his letters (*Corr.* I, p. 162) and later, bought a copy to be hung in his study at Croisset. However, Bertrand, in his edition of the second *Tentation,* and Maynial in *la Jeunesse de Flaubert,* give due weight to the youthful productions named above, and point out that at the Rouen fair the mystery play of *Saint-Antoine* was

[1] E. Maynial, *La Jeunesse de Flaubert,* Paris, 1913. Chapter II.

still presented in Flaubert's youth, by an individual known as *le père* Saint Antoine, whose production had been popular for many years. It would seem, then, that the germ of the three versions of the *Tentation* (1849, 1856, 1872) had been alive in Flaubert from very early youth. He needed but the enthusiasm created in him by Breughel's painting to start him definitely on the composition of his drama in 1848.[8]

Who or what is *Smarh?* The author tells us himself in a letter to his friend Chevalier (*Corr.* I, p. 46):

"Satan conduit un homme (Smar) dans l'infini, ils s'élèvent tous deux dans les airs à des distances immenses. Alors en découvrant tant de choses, Smar est plein d'orgueil. Il croit que tous les mystères de la création et de l'infini lui sont révélés, mais Satan le conduit encore plus haut. Alors il a peur, il tremble, tout cet abîme semble le dévorer, il est faible dans le vide. Ils redescendent sur la terre. Là c'est son sol, il dit qu'il est fait pour y vivre et que tout lui est soumis dans la nature. Alors survient une tempête, la mer va l'engloutir. Il avoue encore sa faiblesse et son néant. Satan va le mener parmi les hommes; 1[e] le sauvage chante son bonheur, sa vie nomade, mais tout à coup un désir d'aller vers la cité le prend, il ne peut y résister, il part. Voilà donc les races barbares qui se civilisent. 2[e] ils entrent dans la ville, chez le roi accablé de douleurs, en proie aux sept péchés capitaux, chez le pauvre, chez les gens mariés, dans l'église qui est déserte. Toutes les parties de l'édifice prennent une voix pour le plaindre depuis la nef jusqu'aux dalles, tout parle et maudit Dieu. Alors l'église devenue impie s'écroule. Il y a dans tout cela un personnage qui prend part à tous les événements et les tourne en charge. C'est Yuk le dieu du grotesque. Ainsi à la première scène pendant que Satan débauchait Smar par l'orgueil, Yuk engageait une femme mariée à se livrer à tous les premiers venus sans distinction. C'est le rire à côté des pleurs, et les angoisses, la boue, à côté du sang. Voilà donc Smar dégoûté du monde, il voudrait que tout fût fini là, mais Satan au contraire va lui faire éprouver toutes les passions et toutes les misères qu'il a vues. Il le mène sur des chevaux ailés sur les bords du Gange. Là, orgies monstrueuses et fantastiques, la volupté tant que je pourrai la concevoir, mais la volupté le lasse. Il éprouve donc encore l'ambition. Il devient poète; après ses illusions perdues, son

[8] In a letter published by M. Descharmes in the *Edition du Centenaire*, 1922, I, 235-237, dated October, 1847, Flaubert expresses his intention of trying *Saint-Antoine* the following summer. The first version was composed May, 1848, to September, 1849.

désespoir devient immense, la cause du ciel va être perdue. Smar n'a point encore éprouvé d'amour. Alors se présente une femme . . . . une femme . . . . il l'aime, il est redevenu beau, mais Satan en devient amoureux aussi. Ils la séduisent chacun de leur côté. A qui sera la victoire? à Satan, comme tu penses? Non, à Yuk, le grotesque. Cette femme c'est la vérité et le tout finit par un accouplement monstrueux. Voilà un plan chouette et quelque peu rocailleux. . . . Je fais des ouvrages qui n'auront pas le prix Montyon et dont la mère ne permettra pas la lecture à sa fille, j'aurai soin de mettre cette belle phrase en épigraphe."

In this scenario one is reminded first of scene two of *Cain:* "The Abyss of space." Then the description of the savage leaving his forests for the towns and the scene in the cathedral suggest passages from Quinet's *Ahasvérus.* The introduction of the grotesque personified brings to mind Hugo's dramatic theory as laid down in the preface to *Cromwell.* The tottering throne and moribund king recall the emperor of the Second *Faust,* the various phases of worldly grandeur through which Smar passes bring back the whole Faust story, while the final scene in which love almost triumphs over sin has many parallels. Of these it is sufficient to name *Ahasvérus* again and *Faust.* Finally we turn to the *Tentation de Saint-Antoine,*—part VI of the 1872 version, part III of the 1849 and 1856 versions,—and realize that this situation in its main features had made a lasting impression on the young writer.

The basic idea in the outline given above is not so much merely a man tempted beyond his forces by Satan, as the creation of a series of situations all illustrative of the essential misery, the nothingness, the wretchedness of men. Flaubert had maintained this thesis at great length in *Mémoires d'un fou,* written probably in 1838; his letters at this period abound in pessimistic utterances; and it is this idea, somewhat less metaphysically and grandiloquently garbed, that may be called the basis of his great works; very evidently of *Madame Bovary* and the *Education sentimentale* (1869), less plainly but undoubtedly of *Salammbô* and of the *Tentation.* Descharmes and Ferrère [3] have justly pointed out the pessimistic determinism which constituted the foundation of Flaubert's philosophy. (See *Smarh,* pp. 31, 34, 35.)

[3] R. Descharmes, *Flaubert . . . avant* 1857, Paris, 1909; E. L. Ferrère, *L'Esthétique de Flaubert,* Paris, 1913.

Let us make an analysis of the mystery as completed. It may be roughly divided into three acts of very unequal length: Act I, The Temptation; Act II, The Trial of Smarh in space; Act III, The Trial of Smarh on earth (Compare Byron's *Cain:* I, The Temptation; II, 1–The Abyss of Space, 2–Hades; III, Cain on earth again. The murder.) There is a prologue in which Satan declares his mastery over the world. He has undermined all faith, exposed the hollowness of virtue, of science and before hovering over the ruins of a moribund earth, will prove by one last example, by bringing wretchedness to the pious Smarh, that virtue no longer exists. In Act I (The Temptation) he appears to Smarh clad as a doctor, flatters his saintly pride, insinuates in him doubt and self-distrust and promises him real knowledge. Here too is the incident already mentioned of Yuk and the married woman. Act II takes us into space. Smarh and Satan reason of the worlds they see, of creation, of free will, of final causes. Smarh, full of doubts and fears, begs for the earth again, and a knowledge of men. In Act III they consider in turn man's insignificance before the forces of nature over which he claims domination, man's madness in abandoning his fields and forests for towns and their corrupting influences, the sordid miseries and crimes of the city, with examples of marriage *à la mode,* of social misery, of the decay of religion and its ministers; and a confused procession of scenes in which Smarh visits a cemetery, plunges into all the sinful lusts of the flesh, from women to empire, sounds the hollowness of poetic ambition, recalls the peaceful hours of his childhood, and finally beholds the woman whom he may really love. The whole ends with an incoherent scene in which Satan contends in his turn for the woman's love, dashing his rival off into space. But Yuk seizes the woman for himself, raising aloft his sardonic, mocking laugh. He it was who had played Asmodeus to Smarh in his visit to the habitations of men, he it was who hobnobbed with the vision of death that appeared claiming all things for her maw when Smarh in his lust of power was reddening the earth with the blood of the slain, and he it is, the monstrously fantastic, the grotesque, that wins at last, over death, over love, over the arch-fiend himself.

It will be remarked that Flaubert, in the final draft, did not depart essentially from the plan as laid down in his letter. Thus,

almost from the beginning of his career, he seems to have had clearly outlined in his mind the general bearing, even many important details, of his productions long before they took definite form. The appendices and other matter accessible in the Conard edition show that this was eminently true of his later years.

This introduction should make clearer what follows concerning the sources from which Flaubert drew inspiration for *Smarh.* The question has been already considered by Descharmes and Maynial. The former finds in *Faust* and *Ahasvérus* the principal influences; the latter in the mystery play of *Saint-Antoine* and in the second *Faust.* Descharmes has pointed out undoubted parallelisms between *Smarh* and *Ahasvérus* (pp. 116 ff.), but the comparison with *Faust* has not been made in detail. We shall first do this, then supplement by a few items Descharmes' comparison with Quinet's poem, adding thereto certain other observations.

One would expect, *a priori,* a very considerable resemblance of *Smarh* to *Faust,* in view of the fascination Goethe's poem exercised upon Flaubert (*Corr.* I, p. xxxv). At least the general conception of the work seems to have had its source there. But one must admit that there is quite as much likeness between the general design of *Smarh* and the first two acts of *Cain* as between Flaubert's work and *Faust.* The Devil's first appearance in *Smarh,* clad as a doctor and launching forth into theological argument, recalls, to be sure, Calderón's *El mágico prodigioso,* as well as the metaphysics of Byron's Satan, whereas his journey with Smarh through space and the discussions that ensue resemble much more the similar scenes in *Cain* than anything in *Faust.* There is no reason to think that Flaubert knew Calderón, and his first reference to *Cain* is of 1847 (*Corr.* I, p. 278), but the close resemblance to the Byronic poem is hardly due merely to sympathy with the English poet's views. From early years his admiration for Byron had been great and traces of *Manfred* are present in *Rêve d'enfer,* a bizarre tale of 1837, which shows also the *Faust* influence, while a passage in *Mémoires d'un fou* is a close imitation of Byron's *Darkness.*[4] Smarh is introduced as a peaceful, contented hermit, to whom Satan brings unhappiness merely by bringing him knowledge. In this, Flaubert's starting point is

[4] Estève, *Byron et le romantisme français,* Paris, 1905, p. 282.

essentially different from that of Goethe or of Byron. However, his Satan, like Byron's, approaches Smarh first to stimulate in him a desire for knowledge, and later returns to conduct his victim through the realms of space and to fill his soul with the doubts that lead him to seek happiness in the world and the flesh, and through these to destruction. The dialogue between Smarh and his guide is a feeble echo of Byron's lines. Especially does Flaubert's Satan appear to be modeled on Byron's and, hence, is much more like Milton's demon than like Goethe's. There is none of the latter's *bonhomie:* Smarh's evil genius is gloomy and rebellious, and would accomplish his purposes more by logic chopping than by the comrade-like methods of Mephistopheles.

If it be granted, however, that in its general conception *Smarh* draws more from *Cain* than from *Faust,* there yet remain parallels between the latter and Flaubert's mystery. In *Smarh* it is Yuk, the demon of the grotesque, who does the comedy part, and there is a scene in what we have called Act I, in which he takes Smarh's place and corrupts a woman who has come to consult the hermit, much as Mephistopheles humbugs the student in Faust's study. Flaubert's humor was always of the brutal kind, and in a scene like this where he desires pitilessly to expose human frailty, the result is not humorous.

In this same scene (p. 17) Satan argues against the immortality of the soul, whereas Faust (p. 73) [5] expresses his lack of concern about the existence of his. The disbelief in the soul's future life was, however, a firmly fixed tenet of Flaubert's creed.

Everyone recalls the splendid revery of Faust: "Erhabner Geist, du gabst mir, gabst mir alles, warum ich bat," with its pantheistic utterances: "Tu as amené devant moi la longue chaîne des vivants, et tu m'as instruit a reconnaître mes frères dans le buisson tranquille, dans l'air et dans les eaux" (p. 128). This same delight in inanimate nature is apparent in the opening pages

[5] Translation of Gérard de Nerval, *Oeuvres Complètes*, Calmann-Lévy, n. d. The translation of the First Part appeared in 1828; of the Second Part in 1840. Earlier translations were Sainte-Aulaire (1823) and Stapfer (1823, 1838). I have had access only to the translation by Gérard. H. Blaze published an article on the Second *Faust* in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* in 1839. See Baldensperger, *Bibliographie critique de Goethe en France*, 1907.

of part III of *Smarh* (p. 44; cf. p. 109). The opening lines here seem to have been suggested by the second *Faust* where the hero says: "Cette clef . . . m'a ramené sur ce terreau solide. Ici je prends pied ici est le domaine du réel" (p. 199). Smarh cries upon his return to earth: "Me violà enfin sur la terre! l'homme naturellement s'y sent bien, il y est né. Moi je suis fait pour y vivre" (p. 43). A few pages later in the same scene Satan persuades Smarh to seek satisfaction "dans la joie, dans le bruit, dans l'ambition" (p. 55) just as Mephistopheles induced Dr. Faustus to quit his study and see life (pp. 76 ff.), but it is Yuk again who is charged with acting as guide to the hermit. When Smarh declares that his body is too old to face new temptations Satan rejuvenates him (p. 87) but by less regulation means than Mephistopheles employs. In addition to this brief list of likenesses there are some points to be noted in which Smarh may have profited by the second *Faust.* Like Goethe, Flaubert describes a royal palace, the lord of which is wretched in his power (p. 67). Then we see Faust on the field of battle craving action: "Je veux frapper d'admiration les races humaines. Je veux laisser des monuments de mon passage et pétrir enfin la nature au moule idéal de ma pensée. Assez de rêves: la gloire n'est rien, l'action est tout" (p. 249). Similarly Smarh cries: "Je veux être un des souvenirs du monde, et le manier dans mes deux mains, et le battre longtemps avec les quatre pieds de mon cheval." (p. 99.)

To be compared also are the scenes in which, on the one hand, Vagner compliments his unhappy master upon the people's love for him (p. 58) and, on the other, Satan flatters Smarh by citing the esteem in which he is held (p. 15), and Mephistopheles' speech (p. 78) with Satan's projects (pp. 11, 88; 94, 98). Similarly, for venturing to express views about God and the soul, Satan and Mephisto taunt their victims in like manner (compare *Smarh,* p. 17, with *Faust,* p. 120).

It may be noted also that *Smarh,* like *Faust,* has a prologue, though not in heaven. Flaubert's sardonic, sombre deity is heard as "Une Voix"; he proclaims himself the real deity of the world: "je l'ai élevé, j'ai été sa nourrice et sa mère; . . . j'ai été sa compagne et son épouse. . . . Je lui fermerai les yeux, je me pencherai sur sa bouche pour recueillir son dernier râle et pour voir si sa

dernière pensée te bénira, Créateur (p. 10). This is quite different from the rather friendly interview in *Faust* between the Deity and Mephisto. There the devil contents himself with saying of the world: "Tout y va parfaitement mal, comme toujours; les hommes me font pitié dans leurs jours de misère, au point que je me fais conscience de tourmenter cette pauvre espèce" (p. 38).

Flaubert's debt to Goethe is not great. He seems to have taken a part of the general plan (II) from *Cain* rather than from *Faust*. It is in the first and third parts that his mystery resembles most Goethe's poem: in the prologue, announcing what is to come, in the fiend's promises which entice the hermit from his cell, and in the various stages of earthly splendor and self-indulgence through which he conducts his victim to his death. Through all these scenes is manifest Flaubert's pessimism and his subjective view of life. His Satan has none of the fantastic, mocking semi-seriousness of Mephisto, nor at the close is there any hope for wretched humanity such as glimmers through clouds at the end of the *Faust* tragedy.

Another source for *Smarh* is Quinet's prose poem, *Ahasvérus* (1833), the story of the wandering Jew, presented as a mystery play. Maxime du Camp tells of Flaubert's fondness for this now forgotten production. Descharmes (p. 115 f.) has pointed out various resemblances between it and *Smarh,* and remarks also on the pessimism of both productions, though Quinet's hero is redeemed from his curse by the love of a compassionate angel woman. In addition to these details, we may add that Flaubert's conception of the savage as being drawn forward irresistibly to civilization (p. 57) seems to be a reminiscence of Quinet's first day (IV, p. 78 f.) in which the migrations of the races toward their respective lands is depicted. Likewise the deserted cathedral, visited by Smarh (p. 79 f.) which crumbles while Satan rejoices, has points of resemblance with the scene in the Strasburg Cathedral (*Ahasvérus,* pp. 258-279). The details of the two scenes are quite different, and both are too long to cite, but in both the church and its different parts monologue at length. Flaubert's cathedral declares that faith is dead and that believers no longer cross its threshold; the chorus of the dead that haunt the Strasburg church assert that Christ is dead and not risen.

The vision of death in *Smarh* (p. 103) shakes the shroud by

which it is covered and from it falls red dust: "C'est l'histoire, ajouta le spectre." Similarly, Mob in *Ahasvérus* (p. 272) addressing the dead monarch cries: "Si vous tombez en poussière, songez-y! comment ferais-je en jetant à poignée votre cendre à la face du Seigneur, pour dire sans me tromper du siècle . . . : Seigneur, ceci qui poudroie dans ma main . . . c'est trente siècles des rois de Syrie et de Chaldée; . . . ceci c'est mille années du royaume de Bretagne, avec ses pairs . . . qui ternissent en retombant l'agrafe d'un de vos souliers. . . !"

In a letter of 1838 (*Corr.* I, p. 28) Flaubert says: "Vraiment je n'estime profondément que deux hommes, Rabelais et Byron les deux seuls qui aient écrits dans l'intention de nuire au genre humain et de lui rire à la face." Such is the rather incomplete judgment of the sixteen year old critic. He may have had in mind such a conception of authorship when he created the character of Yuk. It has already been pointed out that the theory of the grotesque as laid down in Hugo's Preface to *Cromwell* was doubtless Flaubert's starting point, but in his own utterances on Rabelais we find as it were the germ of Yuk, or at least, of what he had in mind when outlining this character. "Rabelais alors est un Luther dans son genre. Sa sphère c'est le rire. Mais il le pousse si fort, qu'avec ce rire il démolit tout autant de choses que la colère du bonhomme de Wittenberg. Il le manie si bien, il le cisèle tellement dans sa vaste épopée, que ce rire-là est devenu terrible. C'est la statue du grotesque. Elle est éternelle comme le monde. (*Rabelais, O. de J.* II, p. 144). "Est-ce que je ne suis pas aussi éternelle que l'éternité?" demands Yuk (p. 78). And again: "je suis toute l'éternité à moi seul" (p. 105). Continuing his appreciation of the Rabelaisian grotesque as compared with Falstaff and Sancho Panza, Flaubert says: "Placée entre ces deux figures, celle de Gargantua est plus vague, moins précise. . . . Gargantua est moins glouton, moins sensuel que Falstaff, moins paresseux que Sancho, mais il est plus buveur, plus rieur, plus criard. Il est terrible et monstrueux dans sa gaieté" (p. 155). Thus, when under the influence of the old mystery play of *Saint Antoine,* and of *Cain* and the romantic theory of the drama, Flaubert undertook to express his own pessimism, he almost naturally created the Gargantuan figure of Yuk, through which to find expression at once for his own brutal irony and for his literary theories and interpretations.

This is in all probability the basis of the bold and original concept he attempted to embody in Yuk, though certain passages in which this personage plays a part have a more definite source. Under Yuk's guidance Smarh enters a city (p. 65) and by the virtue of a certain powder or merely of his infernal power, all the iniquities of the citizens are exposed to their view. There Yuk is no other than Asmodeus, nor do we need refer to the book of Tobit to find Flaubert's source, but to the grateful deity of *Le Diable boiteux* (ed. Garnier), who also presents a type of sarcastic reflection on humanity which Yuk's creator must have relished. Like Yuk, Asmodée offers to show Léandro Perez the world (p. 71), like him he makes roofs and walls of no avail against his follower's gaze (p. 15), like him he sends forth a magic vapor which shows men's passions at their worst (p. 95). But Asmodée is a better natured devil than Yuk. It is his business to foster evil, yet he shows more kindly interest in his disciple, and he can not help disclosing a few instances of virtue and self-sacrifice. Romantic pessimism was far more intense than that of the classical school, and Flaubert lacked the saving grace of humor to lighten his diatribes against human weaknesses.

One of the ways in which Yuk held mankind up to scorn was to stage in some vague fashion for Smarh's benefit a *Petite Comédie Bourgeoise.* This is a sordid and rather dull satire on marriage (pp. 70-74). A young couple go through the various stages of courtship, marriage, passion, disillusionment, indifference and infidelity. It is just a chapter of the ten thousand directed against matrimony at this epoch. Consequently no precise source could be given, but the author refers (p. 72) to Balzac's *Physiologie du mariage* for an analysis of the various stages of wedded life, and thus indicates with a certain precision the general character of his ideas. He concludes like Balzac that infidelity on both sides is to be expected.

I have pointed out elsewhere [6] that two incidents in the drama are drawn from Gautier. There are many purely romantic passages, such as abound in other youthful compositions of Flaubert, and still others (especially pp. 111-116) which are manifestly echoes of the author's own emotions, parts of his own confessions.

[6] *Elliott Monographs*, No. 1, p. 31.

One has but to turn, however, to Descharmes or to Maynial to get the setting of such pages. A lad of the time who knew *René* by heart and read Charles Nodier and *Obermann*, and *Werther*, and *Childe Harold* would have been a prodigy to escape being tarred with the same stick. Flaubert added to their romantic melancholy a brutal sneer, a coarse contempt of all human relations, a sort of delight in rolling them in the mire, which keep him from being a mere copyist.

Flaubert would have defended himself vigorously after 1850 from the charge of having a purpose in his writings other than the attainment of the beauty to which he aspired. It is evident though that in *Smarh*, as is to be expected in the productions of this period, he had a very real purpose: the expression of the deterministic pessimism to which his reflections and emotions had led him. Of the sources to which reference has been made, *Cain* and *Ahasvérus* contain perhaps the largest element of such a view of life. I have already intimated how strongly suggestive of *Cain* are the arguments in *Smarh* between the hermit and Satan. One may fairly say then, that this production is largely Byronic, even specifically Byronic in idea, and that the prevalent literary fashions made Flaubert attempt to incorporate certain other elements, the whole animated by his own savage and unhumorous pessimism. He borrowed here and there, and he tried to weld together disparate elements, but he made for himself the larger part of the real content of his *mystère*, and expressed through it his own conception of life. He was haunted by a desire to project his fancy into the infinite and to express what might be found there. This he boldly attempted to do in *Smarh*. It is a commonplace to remark upon the romantic temperament of Flaubert, to contrast what he seemed to do in *Madame Bovary* with the man himself. *Smarh* is evidence of how the youthful romantic struggled with the philosophical problems that beset him, and manifests a direct concern with such questions to be remarked nowhere else in his riper works except in what he called his "vieille toquade de Saint-Antoine."

ALGERNON COLEMAN.

The University of Chicago.

REGARDING CIRCUMLOCUTIONS IN THE *ELDER EDDA*

I

Circumlocution of an Adverb of Place

In the *Elder Edda* we occasionally find a peculiar type of circumlocution in connection with a verb of motion, *i. e.,* the locality is described to which the person in question is going. This rhetorical figure in Old Norse poetry is so rare that it has, so far as I know, escaped the attention of scholars and were it not for the fact that this same type of circumlocution is preserved in West Germanic poetry the subject of its existence would hardly merit discussion. As a matter of fact, however, this type of circumlocution was evidently a fundamental characteristic of Germanic epic poetry, in keeping with the desire to describe rather than to denote; a poetic ideal which culminated in the *kennings.*

Of this type of circumlocution in the *Elder Edda* [1] I have found only the two following examples:

Baldrs Draumar, 4

þá reiþ Óþinn   fyr austan dyrr,
þars hann vissi   vǫlvu leiþi

"Then did Odin ride east from the gate to where he knew was the grave of the prophetess."

Helreiþ Brynhildar, 11

Reiþ góþr Grana   gollmiþlandi,
þars fóstri minn   fletjum stýrþi

"The brave (Sigurd), the gold-giver, did ride Grani to where my foster-father ruled his hall."

In both these passages we find a circumlocution involved after the verb of motion, viz., 'where such a thing or person was' instead of 'to that thing or person.' [2]

[1] Quotations from the *Elder Edda* are based upon the Hildebrand-Gering edition[4], Paderborn, 1922.

[2] Cf. a similar circumlocution,

Hymiskv. 1, 7-8.

hurfu at hǫllu   es Hymir átti

"They came to the hall *that Hymir owned,*" instead of "to Hymir's hall."

In the Old Saxon *Hêliand*[3] this type of circumlocution is very common. Compare, for instance, ll. 249-251

> Thô uuarð is uuîsbodo
> an Galilealand, Gabriel cuman,
> engil thes alouualdon, *thar he êne idis uuisse*

with the Old Norse (*Baldrs Draumar,* 4)

> *þars hann vissi vǫlvu leiþi,*

or ll. 5269-70

> antat sie inan brâhtun, *thar he an is benkia sat,*
> cuning Herodes:

with the Old Norse *Helreiþ Brynhildar,* 11)

> *þars fóstri minn fletjum stýrþi.*

Similarly in the *Hêliand,* ll. 758, 873, 1151, 1154-5, 2745-6, 5441, 5730, 5736, 5763-4.

Likewise in Middle High German epic poetry, especially in the *Nibelungenlied* and the *Kudrun,* this type of circumlocution very frequently appears. The following examples are quoted from the *Nibelungenlied:*[4]

> (611^1) Dô brâht' man Kriemhilde dâ man den künic vant,
> (783^1) Er gie zuo Prünhilde da er si sitzen vant;

similarly 918^1, 1023^1, 1073^1, etc.

And even in the Old High German *Hildebrandslied* we have the same rhetorical figure when Hiltibrant says (ll. 50-51):

> ih wallôta sumaro enti wintro sehstic ur lante
> *dâr man mih eo scerita in folc sceotantero.*

Evidently the reason why this type of circumlocution occurs so much more frequently in West Germanic than in North Germanic epic poetry is because North Germanic epic poetry is far less narrative in character than is the *Hêliand* or the *Nibelungenlied.* The *Poetic Edda* is dramatic, full of dialog and intensely subjective rather than narrative or descriptive of outward events; hence

[3] Quotations from the *Hêliand* are based upon Behagel's edition[2], Halle, 1910.

[4] Quotations from the *Nibelungenlied* are based upon Bartsch's edition, 1886.

in North Germanic epic poetry the earlier decadence of this rhetorical figure used in connection with a verb of motion, for the verb of motion itself designates an action which properly belongs to the narrative. In fact, much of the narrative in the *Poetic Edda* is not contained in the verses proper but is supplied in prose by the scribe; an additional reason for the decadence of a rhetorical metaphor which has to do primarily with the narrative.[5]

II

Vaxa fyr vina brjósti

This phrase occurs twice in the *Elder Edda,* namely

Fáfnismál 7, 1

'Veitk, ef *vaxa* næþir *fyr þinna vina brjósti*'

and

H. H. I, 9, 1

þá nam at *vaxa* *fyr vina brjósti.*

The phrase *fyr vina brjósti* 'before the breasts of one's friends' is evidently a *kenning* for 'in the presence of, in the sight of, before one's friends.'[6] The question is as to the exact meaning of the word *brjóst* in this phrase and as to the origin of the kenning.

In the sagas the word *brjóst* occurs in the sense of 'person'[7] in the legal phrase *vinna eið fyrir brjóst ehs,* 'to take an oath for *someone,* on *someone's* behalf'; cf. *engi skal eið vinna fyrir brjóst hins dauða . . . . , þá vinnr hann fyrir sitt brjóst en eigi hins dauða* (*Norges gamle love,* Den nyere landslov af Kong Magnus

[5] The existence of this rhetorical figure has not been noted either by Emil Lagenpusch in his *Walhallklänge im Heliand,* Königsberg, 1896, nor by Richard Heinzel in his *Über den Stil der altgermanischen Poesie,* Strassburg, 1875. Paul Piper in his edition of the *Hêliand* (Stuttgart, 1897) calls attention to this figure of speech in the *Hêliand* and remarks that it is characteristic of Old Germanic poetry in general, cf. note to l. 5271: "*thar* dahin wo, diese Umschreibung eines Localadverbs durch einen Relativsatz ist der altdeutschen Sprache überhaupt eigentümlich, besonders oft z. B. im Nibelungenlied und der Kudrun."

[6] Cf. the passage parallel to the *Fáfnismál* 7, 1 in the *Vǫlsunga saga,* ch. 18 (Magnus Olsen's edition, Copenh. 1908): "*Veit ek, ef þu vex upp med frendum þinum.*"

[7] Cf. Fritzner's *Ordbog over det gamle norske sprog*[1], 1886 (sub *brjóst,* 6), *Person, Personlighed?*

Haakonssøn, II, 8, 6. 7). It is in this sense that the word *brjóst* is used in our kenning (*vaxa fyr*) *vina brjósti*, 'persons of friends' = kenning for 'friends.' Evidently then, the word *brjóst* in this sense (i. e., 'person') was taken from the vernacular of the law.

Because of the poetic flavor to this metaphorical sense of the word *brjóst* (i. e., 'person') it was readily incorporated into the language of *Elder Edda* as a kenning in connection with the set poetic formular *vaxa* (*fyr*). The young hero's successful *growth* to maturity amid the dangers of war was always of concern to the poet. Thus Odin says of himself in the *Hávamál* (142):

> þá *namk* frævask ok fróþr vesa
> ok *vaxa* [8] ok vel hafask

and in the *Rígsþula* (9) of young *þræll* it is said:

> hann *nam* at *vaxa* [8] ok vel dafna.

To this idea of the young hero's growth (*vaxa*) was then added the phrase *fyr vina brjósti* as a poetic circumlocution based upon legal vernacular. Such borrowings from legal vernacular [9] imply a late origin of the poem in which they are found, and both the *Fáfnismál* and the *Helgi* lays are consonant with this circumstance.

For the Old Norsemen the *breast* was the seat of both the emotions and the understanding (cf. *brjóstvit*) and the word thus easily acquired the sense of 'person,' cf. MHG. *lîp* [10] 'body' which was often used in epic poetry for 'person,' 'self.'

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT.

University of Kansas.

---

[8] Cf. the Old Saxon *Hêliand* (782-3):

> Thar the neriondio Krist
> *uuôhs undar them uuerode* uuarð giuuittieს ful.

Altho these lines are based upon the Latin of *Tatian* XII (Luke 2, 40): "Puer autem crescebat et confortabatur, plenus sapientia," they are entirely in keeping with the spirit of Old Germanic epic poetry. The young Christ "grew up *among the people*," just as Sigurd and Helgi "grew up *among their friends*" (*fyrir vina brjósti*).

[9] For further legal terms in the *Elder Edda* compare *Sigrdrífumál* 11 *í fulla dóma fara* (cf. *Grágás*, I, 15), 23 *vára vargr*, 25 *heimiskviþr*, 35 *vargdropa;* see *Detter und Heinzel* II, p. 431, note to *Sd.*, 57, 9.

[10] Cf. *des küenen Sîvrides lîp* (*Nib.* 26, 8) 'the brave Siegfried' with ON. *vina brjósti* 'friends.'

THE SPANISH IDIOM *FONDO EN* . . .

This curious idiom, ignored by the dictionaries, has puzzled Hispanists ever since discussion of it was initiated about 1909 *à propos* of a certain passage in Moreto, which we shall designate as A. In 1917 Professor Morley (*MLN,* XXXII, 501-503), discussing A, assembled a series of five further examples, numbered 1-5, and these were increased to seven by Professors Schevill and Buceta (nrs. 6 and 7), but even so no satisfactory explanation was reached. The interpretation since offered by Professor De Perott (*MLN,* XXXIII, 311), unsupported by additional evidence, may be dismissed, I believe, as quite unconvincing. A year later Professor Wagner (*MLN,* XXXIV, 309-310) brought two more examples (which I shall number 8 and 9) and an interpretation with which I must confess I am still unsatisfied.

In a further search for examples, the *entremeses,* with their wealth of idioms, yielded three more usable passages, *viz.:*

10. Mujer.

> Si estos y otros capítulos no firma
> No le daré la mano.
>
> Poeta.
>
> Ni la quiero.
> ¿Soy yo poeta *fondo en majadero?*
> ¿Yo había de jurar eso? No en mis días.
>
> (Castillo Solórzano, *El Casamentero,* in his *Carnestolendas de Madrid* [1627], *apud* Cotarelo, *Colección de entremeses,* I, 308.)

11. A musician retorts to a presumably red-faced servant, who objects to his singing:

> Aunque le pese, *cuero fondo en tinto,*
> cantar quiero y reir, y andar holgado,
> porque ni tengo amor ni so casado.
>
> (Antonio de Mendoza, *Famoso entremes de Getafe,* probably first quarter of the seventeenth century, published from the MS. by Cotarelo, *l. c.,* I, 332.)

12. Lobato to Marisabidilla:

> Trampa con guardainfante,
> treta con alma, chanza de portante,
> enredo con basquiña,
> *embuste* de dos pelos, *fondo en niña,*

festejo universal de aquesta villa
y, sobre todo, Marisabidilla.
(Benavente, *Entremes famoso de la Melindrosa,* in his *Ociosidad entretenida,* 1668, *ap.* Cotarelo, *l. c.*, II, 797.)

These quotations, it must be admitted, do not make the meaning appreciably clearer. However, the quotations from Quevedo contributed by Buceta and Wagner suggested that the author of the *Cuento de cuentos,* with his amazing knowledge of every resource of the language and his known delight in quaint idioms, might well provide additional material. And it was found that the first three volumes of the incomplete edition of Quevedo's works, containing only poetry, but much of it satirical and jocular, gave up no fewer than six new instances of three variant forms of *fondo en,* namely *con fondos en, fondos en,* and *con fondo,* obviously all representing the same idiom:

13. Son sus ternezas con uñas
Como el sol de aquesta tierra,
Pues se muestra amorosa
Con fondos en pedigüeña.
(Quevedo, *Obras,* ed. Fernández-Guerra and Menéndez y Pelayo, II, 34. *Romance* published 1605.)

14. *Con fondos en grajo* asoma
una carita de nieve.
(*Ibid.*, II, 372. *Cf.* nr. 7.)

15. Derrama aquí con unas salvaderas,
Pues está en polvos, todo su linaje;
Salgan progenitores vendesteras,
Y aquel *rabí con fondo abencerraje.*
(*Ibid.*, III, 93.)

16. ¿Cómo siendo mi hermano, y caballero,
Siendo Angélica yo, siendo Argalía,
Una *fantasma fondos en tintero*
Por marido me ofreces este dia,
Un hombre tentación, carantamaula,
Que no puede enseñarse sino en jaula?
(*Ibid.*, III, 129.)

17. Tratóla un *mancebo*
Con fondos en tonto,
Recién heredado. . . .
(*Ibid.*, III, 202.)

18. En la feria de Torrijos
Me empeñé con un mulato,
Corchete fondos en zurdo,
Barba y bigote de ganchos.
(*Ibid.*, III, 265.)

Besides the examples just quoted there are now available the following, printed in previous articles and making nineteen in all: A. Beatriz, fondo en tía; 1. damas fondo en ángel; 2. bruja fondo en moza; 3. bruja fondo en agorera; 4. hermosa, fondo en tabaco; 5. lo blanco fondo en Guinea; 6. primillo, fondo en cuñado; 7. blanca nieve, fondo en grajo; 8. astrólogo, fondo en poeta; 9. muger con fondos en fraile.

A study of all the known instances seems to lead to a literal primary meaning such as Professor Morley suggested: *sobre un fondo de,* or *upon a basis of, with a substratum of,* which might be applied in some instances (4, 5, 7, 11, 14, 16), although perhaps not with the best results. A transferred meaning, more specific, proposed by Professor Wagner: *at bottom, in reality,* would be plausible in some cases (1, 10, 13, 17). However, a still further derived acceptation may be proposed, in which the emphasis has shifted from the *basis,* or the *essentials* to the result of the combination, namely the *mixture,* the *blend,* the *cross.* *Fondo en* would then properly be equivalent to *mezclado de, cruzado con.* This meaning I am tempted to consider as the one that gained most currency, and it seems to do justice to all cases, with such slight variations as seem needed to bring out the peculiar humor of each. For some of the less obvious ones the following tentative translations might be suggested: A. you blend of servant-girl and aunt (obviously a reference to the crafty *Tía fingida* type); 1. the ladies who are half angels; 9. a cross between a woman and a friar; 12. you double cheat in female shape; 15. half Jew, half Morisco; 17. a man, equally young and silly. The idiom seems to have been used with relative frequency to describe the color of the skin; in fact, in six cases out of the nineteen. This might well have further narrowed down its meaning to something like *with a [certain] complexion.* Thus: with a (4) tobacco complexion, (5) a Guinea, or negro, complexion, (7, 14) a crow complexion, (11) a red-wine complexion, (16) an inkwell complexion.

The familiarity of the Spanish mind with just the form of

thought proposed here as a standard may be established by the following instances:

> Celestina casta era
> y recatada,
> y en todo, todo, auisada;
> pero aquesta me semeja
> *moça tinta en puta vieja,*
> más fina y más acendrada.
> (Timoneda, *Farsa llamada Trapaçera*, *Obras*, I, 387.)

> Despedida aquella fantasma tozinera, aquel galán de ramplón, aquel *amante inserto en saluaje,* me acogí debaxo del pauellon de nuestra carreta.
> (López de Úbeda, *La Pícara Justina*, ed. Puyol, I, 153.)

> ¿Quién podrá sufrir a un senor majadero, *oficial enjerto en conde,* que se ahogó su padre en un alcuza. . . .
> (Pedro Espinosa, *Obras*, ed. Rodríguez Marín, 177.)

> Traigo una *mula injerta en dromedario,*
> que a puros sonsonetes me ha traido,
> sin ver todo mudado el calendario.
> (Lope de Vega, *Amar sin saber a quién*, I, 5.)

> ¿*Muger, engerta en varón,*
> en qué piensas?
> (Antonio de Zamora, *Judas Iscariote*, III, Madrid, 1744, I, 320.)

JOSEPH E. GILLET.

Bryn Mawr College.

TWO NOTES ON BEN JONSON'S *STAPLE OF NEWS*

1. Look to me, wit, and look to my wit, Land. (I, i, 3).

Dr. Winter in his edition of this play in the *Yale Studies in English,* p. xxvi, quotes this speech of Pennyboy, Jr., in support of his theory that Jonson was the author of *The London Prodigal,* remarking on its resemblance to a line of that play:

> Luce, look on me that am as light as air.

The speech does certainly bear a striking resemblance to a line in another work, but it is as certainly not the one proposed. It is really a close parody of the first line of Donne's *Elegy upon the Untimely Death of the Incomparable Prince Henry:* [1]

[1] *Poems of John Donne* (*Muses' Library* ed.), p. 72.

Look to me, faith, and look to my faith, God.

It will be remembered that Jonson told Drummond that 'Done said to him he wrott that Epitaph on Prince Henry, Look to me, Fath, to match Sir Ed: Herbert in obscurenesse.'[2] The lines that follow in Jonson may be intended as a satire on the obscurity of Donne's elegy, but there is no more close parody. This fling at the poet he thought 'the first poet in the world, in some things' seems to have escaped even Gifford, who, no doubt, would have been delighted to have had one more proof that Jonson parodied other poets besides Shakespeare.

2. *Thomas.* They write was found in Galileo's study
A burning glass (which they have sent him, too)
To fire any fleet that's out at sea.
Cymbal. By moonshine, is't not so?
Tho. Yes, sir, i'the water.

(III, ii, 54-57)

Tho. They write here one Cornelius-Son
Hath made the Hollanders an invisible Eel,
To swim the haven at Dunkirk, and sink all
The shipping there.
Pennyboy, Jun. But how is't done?
Cym. I'll shew you, sir.
It is an *automa*, runs under water,
With a snug nose, and has a nimble tail
Made like an auger, with which tail she wriggles
Betwixt the costs of a ship, and sinks it straight.

(III, ii, 76-83)

Tho. The perpetual motion
Is here found out by an ale-wife in Saint Katherine's
At the sign of the Dancing Bears.

(III, ii, 106-108)

It seems to me significant that on September 29, 1626 (the same year that *The Staple of News* was presented at Court, but probably later in the year), William Drummond of Hawthornden was actually granted a letter patent for the making of certain very terrific military machines, among which may be found the very three mentioned above. They are described as follows:[3]

[2] *Conversations* (Patterson ed., 1923), p. 12.

[3] From Masson's translation of the Latin original in the 1711 folio ed. of Drummond's Works, 235-236. (Masson, *Drummond of Hawthornden*, 158-159.) In the patent the machines are numbered fourteenth, ninth, and sixteenth respectively.

"A set of Burning Glasses of different kinds, by which, at whatever distance, whether on sea or land, any combustible stuffs, out of all reach of shot, may be set on fire. All these, though consisting of glasses shaped of various conic sections, concave and convex, and of other curved surfaces, and these variously combined, and burning by reflection as well as by refraction, have the common name, Πορρωπυρίπνον, and (not to deprive the illustrious Archimedes of his due honour) will be called *Glasses of Archimedes.*

"A new kind of vessel, which will be able, without check from any strength of chains, bars, or batteries, to enter any harbours, and either destroy all the shipping by fire, or capture them by force; which vessel, from its truly stupendous and terrible effect, and its dreadful destructiveness to ships and harbours, deserves to be called Λιμενολοθρεύτης, vulgarly *Leviathan.* [This does not, however, seem to be a submarine.]

"An organic machine, producing, from a natural and never-wearied cause, Perpetual Motion, by the use of which an infinite variety of mechanical operations may have their principle; which machine is called 'Αεικίνητος, or vulgarly *The Mover.*"

It is not, of course, necessary to suppose that Drummond's patent was the butt of Jonson's satire; it may only be another striking bit of evidence as to the prevalence of that inventive fury of the times which he was ridiculing. However, if Drummond ever really did 'think these out,' as the patent assures us he did, especially, if he ever attempted to reduce them to practical models, he must have been working on them at the time of Jonson's famous visit in the winter of 1618-1619. Masson (pp. 161-165) is inclined to think that the patent is only an example of the iniquitous monopolies so characteristic of the time, perhaps arranged by Sir William Alexander to secure for his friend Drummond by 'its splendidly vague terms' a prior claim for three years to the profits accruing from the actual invention of any practical boat, fire-arm, or telescope in the whole of Scotland. He even supposes that it may have been aimed at a certain Alexander Hamilton, brother of the Earl of Melrose, a practical inventor who had really made an improved cart and secured a patent for it. But even granting that Drummond's interest in military inventions was subsequent to 1619, and that he did not keep Jonson informed of his plans by writing (which we have no way of proving or disproving), there is still another way in which these projects could have come to the attention of the dramatist. From about the time of King James's death in 1625 until the end of 1627 it is impossible to trace Drummond's

whereabouts, but he was certainly not at Hawthornden (Masson, p. 156). He is supposed to have travelled on the continent, but, as Masson points out (*loc. cit.*), he would hardly have stayed in France after July, 1626, when the rupture between England and that country took place. It seems extremely probable that he was in London on September 29, 1626, when the patent was sealed, and more than likely that he had been there for some time previous, for such a business could hardly have been accomplished overnight. If he did go to London, it is incredible that he should not have renewed his relations with Jonson, and equally incredible that Jonson should not have discovered his business in the metropolis. Whether Jonson would deliberately have satirized a person who had treated him so well as Drummond had is a matter which I cannot attempt to decide.

FREDERICK A. POTTLE.

New Haven, Conn.

THE SOURCES OF *OTHELLO*

In an article entitled *A Byzantine Source of Shakespeare's Othello* (*Modern Language Notes,* XXXIX, 156 ff.), Professor A. H. Krappe comes to the conclusion that the play is not derived from Giraldi Cintio's *Ecatommiti,* III, 7, but from an unknown tale descending parallel to Giraldi's from the Byzantine epic of *Digenis Akritas.* The analysis of this epic is most interesting, but the article seems to exaggerate somewhat its significance, possibly because (as it would seem) Professor Krappe has not read the *Ecatommiti* version very recently.

He says at one point (p. 157) that "In the *Hecatommithi* . . . the soldier . . . murders Disdemona by stabbing her twice"; and elsewhere he asks "Why should Shakespeare have deliberately discarded the dagger . . . and preferred . . . the murder in the strange and certainly uncommon manner of choking the heroine with a pillow?" But his memory here has played him false; for according to the *Ecatommiti* Disdemona was slain, not by two strokes with a dagger, but by three blows with a stocking full of sand. It is, strikingly enough, one of the earliest recorded cases of sand-bagging. That Shakespeare could not stomach this stock-

ing full of sand need, surely, not surprise us; some modification was essential. The method had been adopted by Giraldi's characters in order to avoid bloodshed and to make Desdemona's death seem accidental: Shakespeare either worked out for himself or found elsewhere a form of death equally bloodless (though this was less essential in *Othello*), and infinitely less crude. Possibly the French translator might prefer a dagger; Shakespeare chose the pillow.

Apart from this, surely few of Shakespeare's plays show closer adherence to the plot of their sources than *Othello* to Giraldi's tale. The plot of the latter, *Ecatommiti,* III, 7, may briefly be summarized as follows:—

A daughter of Venice is so impressed with the valour of a Moor, a distinguished captain in the Venetian service, that she falls in love with him, inspires a like passion in him, and marries him despite her parent's opposition. The Moor is sent off by the Venetian authorities to command at Cyprus: Disdemona, for such is the lady's name, goes with him. The Moor's ancient (alfiere = standard-bearer = ancient) falls in love with Disdemona; but, finding no hope of winning her, he determines on her ruin. To please her Moor husband, Disdemona shows favour to a lieutenant (capo di squadra) of his: the ancient plans to use this fact against her. Very soon, the lieutenant is deprived of his command for wounding a soldier: Disdemona intercedes for him with her husband, and the ancient seizes the chance to insinuate his accusation. He next procures by stealth a handkerchief which the Moor had given to Disdemona, and causes it to be found in the ex-lieutenant's possession. (In all these schemes the ancient makes use of his wife's intimacy with Disdemona.) At last the Moor, convinced that Disdemona has been untrue, determines on her death and charges the ancient with the task of despatching her supposed lover, the ex-lieutenant. The ancient lies in wait for the latter, but has only succeeded in wounding him in the leg when the watch arrives; pretending to arrive with them, he is one of the first to offer sympathy to the wounded man. Then the Moor and his ancient compass Disdemona's death. . . .

And at this point we do find that Shakespeare's tragedy ceases to follow the *Ecatommiti* story, which we hardly need to pursue through the sand-bagging of Disdemona.

Professor Krappe summarizes the *Digenis Akritas* thus:—

1. Digenis Akritas, the hero of the epic, is the son of a Moorish

emir and a Byzantine lady. His origin is indicated by his name and often alluded to.

2. He becomes enamoured of the daughter of a general and governor of a neighboring province. Her name is Eudocia.

3. They elope and are pursued by the father and other relatives of the girl; a battle ensues which ends with the reconciliation of the two parties.

4. She accompanies him to the theatre of his wars, in a borderland of the Empire.

5. When lying upon his death-bed he takes leave of her and kisses her; then, seized with sudden jealousy, he presses her in his arms, and chokes her to death.

Surely this last suggests *Othello* somewhat vaguely, while the outline of Giraldi's tale (as far, at least, as Disdemona's death) is almost valid as a summary of Shakespeare's play.

It is argued (p. 160, n. 14) that the names Shakespeare uses (except for Desdemona's) are not in Giraldi's version. As, however, Disdemona is the only name mentioned at all in the *novella*, the other characters being known merely as *Il Moro, L'Alfieri, Il Capo di Squadra*, etc., there is no real problem involved. Names were indispensable for a play; Giraldi's story did not supply them; so Shakespeare would have to find them elsewhere—the chief ones, it would seem, in the contemporary *God's Revenge against Adultery*. The English poet, as a matter of course, would add new characters, and, in developing the psychology of Giraldi's cruder personages, alter many of the incidents. His chief changes would be to make less undignified the circumstances of Desdemona's murder, and to speed up the subsequent events, which formed something of an anticlimax in Giraldi's version.

In short, it seems that the case for any influence, even indirectly, from the *Digenis Akritas* either on Giraldi's story or on Shakespeare's play is at the best "not proven." That *Othello* had no other source than *Ecatommiti*, III, 7, no-one can venture to declare: that practically no other source was necessary, however, will still seem evident to many who know both versions well.

WALTER L. BULLOCK.

Bryn Mawr College.

REVIEWS

Goethes Gedichte. Ausgewählt, eingeleitet und erläutert von EWALD A. BOUCKE. Kritisch durchgesehene Ausgabe. Bibliographisches Institut, Leipzig [1924]. Sonderdruck aus Meyers Klassiker-Ausgaben. 57 u. 472 Seiten.

Boucke hat eine Auswahl aus Goethes Gedichten für einen "weiteren Leserkreis" (S. 387) getroffen. Wohl in der Erwägung, dass die ersten Abteilungen der Ausgabe letzter Hand von Goethes Werken am meisten gekannt sind, also vermisst würden, nimmt er die Gruppen Lieder, Gesellige Lieder, Balladen, Elegien, Episteln, Epigramme, Jahreszeiten, Sonette vollständig auf, lässt nur drei Stücke weg, die Goethe auch in die Gruppe Gott und Welt eingereiht hat. Den Balladen fügt er die "Legende" an und aus den Cantaten "Johanna Sebus"; die übrigen Cantaten und die Weissagungen des Bakis übergeht er. Von den Vermischten Gedichten lässt er die zwei letzten weg: "Nähe" wohl aus Schicklichkeit, "An die Cicade," weil es nach Anakreon verfasst ist, und ersetzt sie durch zwei Stücke aus den Vermischten Gedichten des Nachlasses (W. A. IV, 101, 104). Nach der Gruppe Aus Wilhelm Meister löst er sich von der alten Ordnung. Manche Abteilungen werden völlig übersprungen, aus Gedichten des 2.–5. Bandes W. A. neue gebildet, zumeist unter den überlieferten Bezeichnungen, zweimal unter neuen Sammelnamen: Aus den Singspielen und Literatur; die letztere Gruppe ist, da die Xenien nicht beigezogen sind, etwas mager. Den Schluss bilden Stücke aus dem Westöstlichen Divan. Die Ordnung im einzelnen leuchtet nicht überall ein. So stehen z. B. vor und nach der Dichtung Ilmenau 1783 Gedichte an Frauen (unter denen die "Sprudel"-Gelegenheitsverse an Tina Brühl recht überflüssig sind); es ist also nicht einzusehen, warum die Lieder an Frau von Stein 1776-1780 nicht vor Ilmenau eingereiht sind. Aber es ist gewiss schwer, eine überzeugende Folge zu bilden, zumal wenn die Goethes doch die Führung behalten soll. Offenbar ist das richtige Bestreben, Proben aus der frühesten bis zur spätesten Zeit, Proben der verschiedensten Arten vorzulegen.

Goethekenner werden dies und jenes Stück vermissen; manchem wird das Fehlen des Gedichtes auf Miedings Tod empfindlich sein,

es ist doch einzig in seiner Weise und nicht dramatischer als anderes. Dagegen dünkt mich die Aufnahme des "Chinesen in Rom" unter Literatur überschüssig, zumal der Bezug auf Jean Paul erst durch die Anmerkung erkennbar wird. Und so wird anderen anderes entbehrlich sein. Es gibt keinen Goethekanon. Origineller ist die viel weniger unmfangreiche Auslese Erich Schmidts im 1. Teile seiner Inselausgabe, die sich an ähnliche Leser wendet, wie sie sich Boucke wünscht. Schmidt bringt gegen dreissig andere Stücke als dieser und trifft bei der Auswahl der Sprüche nur etwa vierzigmal mit ihm zusammen, während er rund hundert von Boucke ausgeschiedene herausgreift; bringt unter 35 Stücken aus dem Divan neunzehn, die Boucke nicht gibt, stimmt also nur in sechzehn mit diesem zusammen. So verschieden ist das Urteil über das, was Goethe kennzeichnet und zugleich für viele Lesegut sein soll. Darüber lässt sich nicht rechten.

Den Text gibt Boucke nach der W. A. Seltene Abweichungen begründet er. Einmal, im letzten Verse des epigrammatischen "Kommt Zeit kommt Rat" möchte ich eine Lesung nicht so "entschieden" vorziehen wie der Herausgeber. Er wählt statt der Lesart der 2. Cottaischen Ausgabe B die der Kaulfuss-Armbruster-Cottaischen B^1, die aus der gleichen Druckvorlage wie B stammt. In B steht: "Hier hilft nun weiter kein Bemühn. Sind Rosen und sie werden blühn." In B^1 lautet der letzte Vers: "Sind's Rosen, nun sie werden blühn." Das ist als dem Verständnis bequemere Fassung des Setzers möglich, der ja überhaupt eigenmächtig verfährt; die Lesart B kann aber nicht aus ihr abgeleitet werden; obwohl deren Setzer nachlässig ist, würde er hier sich doch eines groben Hörfehlers schuldig machen. Wahrscheinlicher hatte die gemeinsame Vorlage die Lesart B, hielt B^1 eine Konjektur für nötig; deren konditionales "Sind's" mir in so bündiger Epigrammatik ungoetheisch vorkommt, deren Wiederholung des "nun" anstössig ist. Übrigens kann ich mir das Reimpaar auch gelöst von der Überschrift zum ersten vorstellen, es für eine allgemeine Warnung vor ungeduldigem Eifer fassen. Zur Überschrift gebunden würden die Verse bedeuten: Zeit bringt Rosen und sie werden blühn.

Die Einleitung, 57 Seiten stark, "verfolgt das Ziel, möglichst viele Gesichtspunkte und Probleme zur Sprache zu bringen und

sowohl den literargeschichtlichen Voraussetzungen wie dem Eigenwert von Goethes Dichtung gerecht zu werden. Im übrigen ruht die Darstellung auf der Annahme einer ursprünglichen Einheit und zentralen Gliederung [?] von Goethes geistiger Individualität: die einzelnen lyrischen Gattungen sind daher nicht rein periodisch angeordnet oder als formale Kategorien aufgefasst, sondern als Ausstrahlungen eines und desselben "poetischen Bildungstriebes," der sowohl Stil wie Gehalt bestimmt und organisch bindet" (S. 387). Ob die Einleitung für einen "weiteren Leserkreis" nicht etwas schwer ist, steht dahin. Boucke sieht die Hauptanregung für Goethe in der Gegenwirkung gegen Eindrücke, die seinen Bildungstrieb auslösten, zur Reaktion wie zur Einfühlung leiteten. Das Wesen von Goethes Dichtung sei die Gestaltung eines Innenerlebnisses, das, des Zufälligen entkleidet, symbolische Funktion zu versehen habe. Für die geschichtlichen Voraussetzungen greift Boucke unnötig bis auf Gottsched zurück, spricht über Lyrik des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts zu knapp, als dass man über Missverständliches streiten möchte, prägt den übertreibenden Satz, "ohne das Vorbild Klopstocks wären Goethes Hymnen nicht denkbar," behauptet, die Mission des deutschen Geistes habe in der Überwindung der Aufklärung bestanden u. dgl. Ich möchte gerne mit ihm an einen besonderen germanischen Individualismus, an germanischen Bewegsdrang, an den organischen Freiheitsbegriff des germanischen Geistes glauben und in Volkslied und Ballade "Naturformen der Dichtung" erkennen können.

Richtig sagt er, Goethes Schaffen lasse sich weder nach Perioden noch nach Zonen (?) oder Schichten genau schematisieren; er versucht aber dann doch zu zergliedern. Gefühlslyrik und Gedankenlyrik aus einander zu halten, musste ihm schwer werden. Die Gefühlslyrik teilt er in Naturformen des Liedes, Kunstformen des Liedes, Balladen, Elegien, Hymnen. Zu den Naturformen rechnet er auch die künstlichen Geselligen Lieder, und verrät damit, wie wenig die Bezeichnung sagt. Die Kunstformen der Gefühlslyrik werden in Anakreontik, römische Elegien, Sonette und die Divanlieder zerlegt; er sieht zwar, dass die Elegien "im Grunde eine Erweiterung der gedrängteren Form, die dem Zyclus der Römischen Elegien zugrunde liege," und ebenfalls aus der griechischen Anthologie erwachsen sind, teilt sie aber doch als eigene Gattung ab, um sie mit den Balladen in "gelegentliche Be-

rührung zu stellen. Aus der Mannigfaltigkeit der Balladenform schliesst Boucke (S. 29), dass sich Goethe auf alle Weise bemühe, "dem Ideal des echten Volksgesangs näher zu kommen"; wenn es dies Ideal gibt, warum wird die Ballade dann nicht zu den Naturformen gereiht? Es sei Goethe nicht gelungen, eine feste Form zu finden oder eine Tradition zu schaffen; ich frage: wo besteht eine feste, Tradition gründende Balladenform ausser in Schulbüchern?—Die Gedankenlyrik wird in Sprüche, Epigramme, beschauliche und lehrhafte Dichtung und wieder den Divan gespalten. Ich fürchte, solche Schematisierung werde manchen Schulmeister verführen, die Schüler mit den von Boucke bezifferten Gliedern 1, 1, a. . . usw. zu quälen; denn das müssen doch die "praktischen Zwecke" sein, für die er zusammenfassen will, was nach seiner eigenen richtigen Einsicht sich nicht reinlich scheiden lässt (S. 33). Schon die doppelte Eingliederung des Divan beweist gegen das Schema.

Für den fruchtbarsten Abschnitt der Einleitung halte ich den letzten: Stil und Vers. Da stehen gute Beobachtungen. Die Vergleiche mit andern Dichtern sind anregend, die mit Eichendorff und Heine besser, als die des "mikroskopisch beschreibenden" Strindberg und des "makroskopisch sehenden" Goethe. Den Äusserungen über die Metrik vermag ich nicht durchwegs beizustimmen; z. B. die ausgehobene Veränderung in V. 8 von "Alexis und Dora" ist gewiss nicht durch Schlegelsche Doktrin veranlasst (S. 51), sondern durch das Bedürfnis, das in der Senkung stehende Wort "ein" als Zahlwort in die Hebung zu bringen.

Besondere Aufmerksamkeit leiht Boucke den Kompositionen Goethescher Lieder, hat ja auch in einem Anhang (S. 443 ff.) die Vertonungen verzeichnet und die bisherigen Nachweise aus eigener Sammlung bereichert. Wenn er erklärt (S. 56), die reiche Klangsymbolik der romantischen Lyrik komme dem Tonsetzer auf halbem Wege entgegen, und gleich darnach, je bedeutender die innermelodischen Eigenwerte eines Gedichtes seien, um so weniger werde es zur Vertonung anregen, so beleuchtet dieser halbe Widerspruch hell die Schwierigkeit, sichere Kennzeichen für die Sangbarkeit eines Liedtextes aufzustellen.

Vor dem Kompositionenverzeichnis steht eine Chronologische Tabelle (S. 436 ff.) worin die abgedruckten Gedichte soweit möglich nach der Entstehungszeit geordnet und die Jahre der ältesten

Drucklegung vermerkt sind; dabei werden neuere über Gräf hinausgehende Untersuchungen verwertet.

Auch die Anmerkungen sind für Goethefreunde und -forscher dadurch sehr dienlich, dass die Literatur über die einzelnen Gedichte darin neu zusammengetragen ist. Sie zeigen die Entstehungszeit, die Quelle, den Anlass an: eine Fülle von gründlicher Arbeit. Gelegentlich wird die Auffassung eines Ganzen gemacht, Einzelerläuterung dunkler Stellen ist nicht beabsichtigt. Hinweise auf verwandte Äusserungen in Goethes Werken gesellen sich bei. Vereinzelt wird einem Ausleger widersprochen. Bei dem schwierigen "An den Mond," werden ausnahmsweise die früheren Fassungen erörtert, dann aber schliesst die Behauptung: glücklicherweise sei es möglich, die poetischen Schönheiten dieses Gedichts auch ohne genauere Kenntnis der kritischen Deutungsversuche "vollauf" zu würdigen. Warum hätten sich dann so viele mit der Erklärung befasst, wenn "das Verweben von Natur und Menschenschicksal," das "An- und Abschwellen der Empfindungen" vollauf klar wäre? So müssen dann und wann Allgemeinheiten aushelfen, zu eindringlichen Untersuchungen wäre ja auch hier kein Raum. Die Strophen "An Lina" beschwert der Herausgeber mit dem Wunsche: die Zeile Nur nicht lesen! immer singen! sollte jeder lyrischen Anthologie als Motto vorgesetzt werden; hat der Vorschlag Wert für die poetische Einschätzung des Verses? Bemerkungen zu dem Geselligen Lied "Rechenschaft" oder zu dem Spruch 21 sollen den Inhalt unserer Zeitlage nahe rücken; die kritische zur Zahmen Xenie 3 moralisiert: "Eine höchst geistvolle Antithese, aber leider zu optimistisch, denn wie viele Irrtümer, wenn sie energisch verfochten werden, haben durch Jahrtausende gewirkt; wie viel wahrhaft Tüchtiges dagegen ist spurlos untergegangen oder wird von Untüchtigen misshandelt und zertreten!" Das sagt sich doch auch ein Leser des weiteren Kreises selbst und es trägt zum Verständnis der Goetheschen Lyrik nichts bei. Glücklicherweise sind derlei Entladungen selten, so dass sie den Gesammtwert der Leistung nicht hinabdrücken.

Bernhard Seuffert.

Graz.

LOPE DE VEGA, *El cuerdo loco,* publicada por JOSÉ F. MONTESINOS. *Teatro antiguo español.* Textos y estudios. IV. Madrid, 1922.

This fourth volume of the *Teatro antiguo español* maintains in every way the high standard set in the preceding volumes of the series. Sr. Montesinos, known to us already for his investigations on the dates and sources of plays by Lope de Vega, is well prepared to edit the present *comedia.* Although *El cuerdo loco* was included in the collection of Lope's plays published by the Real Academia Española under the editorship of Cotarelo y Mori, its publication anew is justified in view of the textual inaccuracies that abound in the Cotarelo edition. Sr. Montesinos follows in his edition the autograph manuscript of the play, indicating in foot-notes the variants of the manuscript and of the two seventeenth-century editions of *Parte XIV* of the *Comedias de Lope de Vega.*

As in the case of the preceding volumes of the *Teatro antiguo español,* the present play is not of exceptional literary merit. As Sr. Montesinos points out, it is one of the innumerable *comedias* which "en horas veinticuatro pasaron de las musas al teatro." Nor is it, like Rojas Zorrilla's *Cada cual lo que le toca,* published in the second volume of the series, of an exceptional ideological character. Nevertheless, like almost any play of Lope's, it offers opportunity for studying certain tendencies in his work, and can thus be of service in rounding out our understanding of the general scope and nature of his theater.

In plot *El cuerdo loco* is similar enough to several other plays of Lope's in which insanity is feigned in order to escape some danger or bring about the fulfilment of some wish, often concerned with love. This situation occasioned usually the employment by the poet of one form of the much-abused device of "engañar con la verdad," that is, having the supposedly insane person's remarks mean one thing to all or most of the characters of the play, and another thing to the audience. Incidentally, Sr. Montesinos sums up in a brief note (pp. 160-161) the best, because the broadest, interpretation of this vague phrase from Lope's *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias* that I have thus far seen, making it cover either the deception of characters within a play by the use of double

entendre or the surprising of the audience by unexpected turns in the plot. Lope's own approval of the latter is expressed not only in his *Arte nuevo* ("Pero la solución no la permita Hasta que llegue a la postrera scena"), but also in one of his plays: "¿No dices tú que es comedia? Pues la que engaña al que escucha, Se suele tener por buena" (*La primera información*, Acad., IX, 607a).

Not only concerning Lope's use of this last-named device, but also about his "insane" characters, his heroes and villains, the appearance on his stage of lese-majesty, the feeling of outraged honor that usually motivates an act of lese-majesty, Lucinda and Belardo in his plays—about these and other matters touching the theater of the great dramatist, Sr. Montesinos has given us, in his "Observaciones," many pages of interesting discussion. In addition, he has provided the usual notes on the interpretation of difficult and unusual passages in the play, and, what has not been done in any of the previous volumes of the series, has catalogued the principal orthographic peculiarities of the manuscript. In this connection it may be stated that he has taken no other liberties with his manuscript than to modernize the punctuation and accentuation, not even following his predecessors in avoiding the classical confusion between *u* and *v*. Even in punctuation he is more sparing than they; *e. g.*, vol. II, l. 212, *aý;* vol. IV, ls. 1507, 2350, *ay* (= *ahí*).

The following changes and additions are the only things that have occurred to me in the way of criticism of this otherwise admirably prepared edition:

P. 154, note. A consideration of "vulgarismos" or spellings conforming to popular pronunciation would hardly be of any consequence in the study of Lope's style, since those found in his manuscripts were, as a matter of fact, quite common to writers of the period, and if anything testify merely to the rather chaotic condition of orthography at that time.

P. 193, l. 12. Is not "octosílabos" a slip for "heptasílabos," since it was the combinations of hendecasyllabics and heptasyllabics ("endecasílabos quebrados," "silvas") that were less frequent in Lope's early plays?

Notas. 3-4. "sirba ese pecho de puerta Por quien su sangre derrame." As *quien* here stands for *la que* (or *donde*), this use of the relative can hardly be said to be rare in Lope, or for that

matter, in classical Spanish in general; *cf.* "Que no puede ser, honra, cosa mala Quien tiene en la virtud su fundamento" (*La obediencia laureada,* Rivad., LII, 171c); "los libros de caballerías, de quien nunca se acordó Aristóteles" (*Quijote,* prólogo).

24-25. A note might have been given here on the use of *vos* with the verb in the singular; *cf.* Cuervo, *Apuntaciones,* § 332.

70. "Remedio" in the sense of marriage, although commonly used in classical Spanish, seems to have escaped the attention of lexicographers. *Cf.* "El ordinario mal de las doncellas: El inmortal deseo de casarse. Si ve que os descuidáis de su remedio, Que ansí le llaman ellas, y es muy justo," etc. (*El ruiseñor de Sevilla,* Acad., XV, 57a); "Hay mil que la miran bien Y impídesle su remedio" (*El desposorio encubierto,* Acad., N., IV, 535b).

421-422. "¡Ay dulçe muger! Qual uid del olmo cortada." One of the commonest metaphors in classical Spanish; for *vid* and *olmo* are sometimes substituted *hiedra* and *muro* (*pared*) or *álamo.* *Cf.* Rivad., XXIV, 359a; Acad., V, 670b; XI, 476a; XIII, 423b; H. Mérimée, *L'Art dramatique à Valencia,* 516.

467. Lope mentions not only French and Swiss, but also German pistols; *e. g.,* "Una pistola cargada, Que hizo el mejor ingenio De los que tiene Alemania" (*Amor con vista, Col. lib. rar.,* VI, 211).

671-674. This repetition of the last word of each verse at the beginning of the next, suggestive of "echo poetry," was a common formula in Lope's theater and in general in the poetry of his time. *Cf.* "Pienso en lo que estoy callando, Callo lo que estoy sintiendo, Siento lo que estoy sufriendo, Sufro lo que estoy penando" (*El Marqués de las Navas,* Rivad., LII, 502b); sonnet: "Temo . . . —¿Qué temes?—Lo que estás temiendo," etc. (*Las dos bandoleras,* Acad., IX, 11ab).

765-766. *Cf.*. "¿No sabes que no hay gustos ni placeres Que olviden la venganza en las mujeres?" "¡Ah! ¡cómo se echa de ver Que pasas, como mujer, Del amor a la venganza!" (*Quien ama no haga fieros,* Rivad., XXIV, 443c). "Que Dios me libre de mujer airada, Y no de la ponzoña de mil víboras" (*El verdadero amante,* Rivad., XXIV, 15c). "Ya sé que en las mujeres Pueden más las venganzas que en los hombres" (*Mirad a quién alabáis,* Rivad., LII, 467c).

1149. "pues allá no es tu vista de ynportancia." *Vista* can

hardly mean here *visita,* as Sr. Montesinos supposes, but seems rather to stand for *presencia,* one of the older meanings of the word. *Cf.* "a nuestra vista le mataron, l'ammazzarono in nostra presenza," Franciosini, s. v. vista; "Yo, Zéphalo, amo tu vista," *Dicc. aut., s.v. vista;* "vista, veue, regard, presence," Oudin, *Trésor.*

2225. "admirado y suspenso," a cliché of classical Spanish; *cf.* "todo admirado y suspenso" (*El castigo del discreto,* Acad., N., IV, 208a); *Quijote,* ed. R. Marín, 1916, III, 71[12] and *passim.*

A continued search in other plays of Lope's would undoubtedly reveal further passages paralleling much of the language, thought, and mannerisms of the present *comedia.* On such a procedure, it seems to me, must be based any more definite understanding than we have at present of Lope de Vega's style, and to this understanding a volume like the present one contributes not a little.

W. L. FICHTER.

Girard College.

Le Français Classique. Lexique de la langue du dix-septième siècle. Par G. CAYROU. Paris: Henri Didier, 1923. xxviii + 888 pp.

Utile en France, un tel livre est indispensable à l'étranger. Fait avant tout en vue de l'explication française, il sera bien accueilli par tous ceux qui goûtent la littérature du XVIIème siècle. En aidant à la bien comprendre, il la fait mieux aimer. L'ouvrage de M. Cayrou n'est bas entièrement neuf. Avant le sien, le *Glossaire* de M. Huguet avait rendu de grands services. Ni l'un ni l'autre n'apportent rien qui ne soit déjà connu en lexicologie. Aussi n'est-ce pas là qu'il faut chercher leur mérite. C'est dans leur condensation, leur portabilité et leur emploi pratique.

Examinons ce que l'auteur s'est proposé de faire dans ce lexique. Préparé à cette tâche par une édition des *Caractères* de La Bruyère, M. Cayrou y a mis l'expérience d'un chercheur assidu et la sagacité du maître pénétré des besoins de l'enseignement. Comme il nous en avertit, il a eu la préoccupation de *l'exactitude scientifique* et celle aussi de *l'utilité pédagogique.* Savoir est bien, en-

seigner est mieux. Le difficile, dans un lexique, est de borner son plan. Quel sera l'étendue du vocabulaire? Ici, deux écueils: d'une part, insuffisance; de l'autre, encombrement. Donc: ont été admis les seuls mots qui, "tombés en désuétude, étaient alors bien vivants, ou qui, usités encore de nos jours, avaient alors d'autres sens." Ont été exclus "les mots trop rares ou trop spéciaux que les élèves ne rencontreront pour ainsi dire jamais dans leurs lectures scolaires." Toutes les définitions ont été empruntées aux dictionnaires de la fin du XVIIème siècle. Ce n'est que lorsqu'elles étaient imparfaites qu'elles ont été rectifiées, complétées éclaircies. Les exemples sont de deux sortes: ceux des dictionnaires d'où les définitions sont tirées et ceux des grands écrivains, ceux-ci préférés à ceux-là, les premiers n'étant acceptés que lorsqu'ils sont suffisants. Le vers se gravant mieux dans la mémoire a le pas sur la prose. Le choix s'est porté spécialement sur les citations typiques d'où le sens des mots ressort avec évidence. Les définitions sont complétées par tout ce qui est de nature à bien éclaircir le sens et à préciser l'usage, surtout pour les mots abstraits.

Dans son *Lexique,* M. Cayrou a mis à profit le labeur de son devancier, M. Huguet, et il s'étend davantage. Ce dernier partait des premiers écrits de Corneille et s'arrêtait aux derniers de Fénelon (1629-1714). M. Cayrou comprend Malherbe et Saint-Simon, soit trois-quarts de siècle de plus (1585-1755), mais il laisse de côté Dancourt et Dufresny cités par M. Huguet. La nomenclature du *Lexique* n'est pas loin d'être le double de celle du *Glossaire,* elle atteint près de 2.200 mots. Les prépositions, conjonctions et pronoms y figurent en plus grand nombre, et ceci est fort louable, car on sait combien l'usage a changé dans ces parties du discours. M. Cayrou signale les différences d'orthographe et de genre entre l'usage du temps et l'usage moderne. Il souligne la distinction à établir entre les mots qui ont des sens proches (tels que *abstrait* et *distrait*). Il indique le jargon d'où le mot est issu (vénerie, jurisprudence, médicine). Si cela jette du jour sur une signification obscure ou ambiguë, il mentionne les antonymes. Enfin, renseignement précieux pour l'étude du langage du XVII[e] siècle, il dit à quelle classe le mot appartient (noble, populaire, burlesque), et aussi dans quelle partie de la période il paraît ou

disparaît (*cavalier, certes*). En outre, innovation heureuse, dans les définitions empruntées aux dictionnaires du temps, ainsi que dans les exemples, s'il se trouve des mots employés dans un sens qu'ils n'ont plus, ils sont suivis d'un astérisque. C'est un avertissement. Une autre nouveauté, celle-ci pédagogique, c'est l'explication étymologique, laquelle est loin d'être superflue, puisque dans nombre de cas, les auteurs ont rendu la vigueur à des mots affaiblis en les retrempant à leur source. Autre initiative dont on ne saurait trop féliciter l'auteur, c'est la disposition typographique de chaque article. Dans un ouvrage à consulter, il faut toujours tendre à l'économie de l'effort et du temps. On a donc pourvu à l'ordre par la distribution des espaces et à la perspective par la grosseur des caractères.

Maintenant, quelques réserves. Dans le *Glossaire,* il y avait bien des termes qui ne sont guère dans les classiques. Malgré ce qu'il en dit dans sa préface, M. Cayrou a peut-être suivi son devancier d'un peu près dans ces excursions en dehors du grand chemin. Les amateurs de mots ne s'en plaindront pas, mais l'auteur n'a pas rédigé son lexique pour le divertissement des oisifs curieux de vocables. Il l'a fait pour des élèves qui désirent tourner le moins de pages possibles. N'aurait-il pas mieux valu laisser de côté des mots d'un emploi si rare, si particulier,[1] et remplir l'espace assez vaste qu'occupent ces intrus par des exemples plus nombreux, parfois moins écourtés, de termes d'un emploi plus répandu? En effet, quelques exemples importants ne sont là qu'à l'état de références. Or, on sait ce qu'il advient. L'exemple reste enterré où il est, parce que l'élève n'a pas l'œuvre sous la main, (il lui faut même certaines éditions), ou ne se soucie pas de la feuilleter. Toute proportion gardée, M. Huguet, moins volumineux, cite davantage, et c'est pour le mieux. Ce que M. Cayrou gagne ailleurs en valeur, il le perd ici en efficacité; c'est bien dommage.

Le lexique est précédé d'une bibliographie détaillée. On sait l'importance prise dans ces dernières années par l'enseignement

[1] Entre autres, pris au hasard dans les trois premières lettres: *altercas, audace* (= *ganse*), *bandeau* (*de veuve*), *bigle, bissêtre* (= *accident*), *blanque, case* (=*maison*), *chargeant, chartre, chevir.* Propres au *Lexique: appartement* (= *divertissement*), *babouin, billebaude, bonneter, bourle, chalemi, chaumine.*

visuel. L'auteur en a tenu compte. Le livre se termine par la reproduction photographique, un peu trop réduite malheureusement pour être aussi utile qu'elle le pourrait, d'un bon nombre de documents se rapportant à un lexique; portraits de grammairiens et lexicographes, titres, frontispices, pages spécimens d'ouvrages divers sur la langue. Ces fac-similés seront particulièrement appréciés à l'étranger où les originaux sont rares et peu à portée du commun des élèves.

En somme, l'ouvrage de M. Cayrou est un progrès sur celui de M. Huguet. Ceci suffirait à le recommander. Quant à moi, je lui ai fait subir des épreuves nombreuses et diverses et je suis heureux de déclarer qu'il s'en est tiré à son honneur. J'ai choisi des mots importants ou typiques dont j'ai examiné les articles en les confrontant avec ceux des lexiques et dictionnaires spéciaux et je n'ai pu que constater l'exactitude et le soin avec lesquels l'auteur avait procédé. J'ai employé le *Lexique* comme il doit l'être, autrement dit, je l'ai consulté dans le besoin et j'y ai trouvé ce que je cherchais. Quel meilleur éloge lui décerner?

HENRI DAVID.

University of Chicago.

Writing, by JOHN C. FRENCH, Ph. D. Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1924.

An author needs daring to bring out a new textbook on compotition to-day. Professor French's *Writing* will encounter fierce competition, but will make a place for itself because of its rich combination of the wisdom of the seasoned teacher and the subtle and artistically dry accuracy of the scientific scholar. It is easy to entertain undergraduates, and easy to have the courage to be hard and plain, when hard facts are in order, but a combination of the virtues is rare. This combination is the great claim of this book for respectful attention. It eschews the sophomoric eccentricity of Baldwin's work and its like, and the dull drill of Wood's and its like. It is a combination of the two, founded on the age-old traditions of Whateley, Blair, Genung, Hill, and the rhetoric of the ancients. In one particular though the book is essentially modern, in its arrangement of chapters, with the chapter on

organization first, followed in order by those on paragraphs, sentences and words,[1] the same order used successfully in our day by Newcomer and others.

Besides this judicious arrangement of chapters, there are three other fine general features: the opening chapter on theme-writing with its lists of subjects, adroitly designed to make the student think out the problems of his own life while he writes; second the inclusion of chapters on exposition, description, narration, and argumentation, chapters often omitted by other books in an unwise effort to save time; third the division of the work into a first part on style, and a second on conventional grammar, punctuation, the preparation of manuscripts, and such matters. This last feature may be unwise for use in certain sections of the South and West, where the teacher is forced to regard rudimentary grammar and the conventions of language as a part of the college course, not as an afterthought to be treated as if part of an appendix. But in such case the teacher can easily assign to students the later chapters simultaneously with the earlier.

The chapter on punctuation opens appropriately with a survey of general principles, but proceeds somewhat hastily to the customary rules, which are practically those formulated by John Wilson[2] and handed down to a series of later writers. These rules serve well enough in the case of certain conventional marks, but in the case of the comma they are open to the objection that while they state correctly where commas are to be put, they do not answer the perfectly justifiable undergraduate question, "Why?" As most commas are instinctive pauses, probably prehistoric in origin, they might be profitably treated as part of a chapter on sentences. But no textbook has yet had the temerity to do this, and Professor French adheres to tradition in the matter, adding, however, his general survey of principles.

That spoken discourse should be subordinated in a book on writing is natural, but it is wise not to separate widely language

[1] Cf. "Sentence and Word" by Leonard Bloomfield, *Trans. and Proceedings of the American Philosophical Assoc.*, Vol. XIV (1914), pp. 65-75, in which is advanced the supposed precedence of the sentence over the word in date of development.

[2] For history of Wilson's rules, cf. C. H. Ward, "Punctator Gingriens," *English Journal*, Sept. 1915, p. 451.

addressed to the eye and language addressed to the ear. The effective rhythms of spoken language are difficult to reproduce with pen and paper, unless there is also practice in speaking. This Professor French has in mind when he urges the student to read his own book aloud (p. 106), but more may be made of this phase of study by the ingenious teacher who is willing to elaborate on the materials supplied him.

A subject of great interest to the undergraduate student of composition is the origin and nature of language. And on both of these problems his own reactions are profitable. He may find out very little about the origin of language, but the thinking about it is useful. The nature of language is of supreme importance to him, and is well handled by Professor French, especially in his chapter on words, where the difference between literal and suggestive language is well emphasized. Possibly this treatment does not belong in a chapter on words, but it fits there as well as elsewhere, so long as there is no chapter on the psychology of language, where it would naturally fit.

The chapters on the forms of discourse are suggestive and full enough. In one place in the chapter on narrative the reader may be inclined to take issue on a statement of fact. The author says that narrative must move forward and that narrative that repeats its events, as a news story does, is "really a combination of exposition and narration." But how does this square with the practice of Joseph Conrad, many of whose novels are practically narrated backwards?

The illustrative material of the book is well chosen, fresh for the most part, and full enough without being redundant. Too much drill material has a tendency to reduce the teacher to a drill-master. This the author avoids. There is also a complete index, and inside the front cover a serviceable table of the marks used in correcting themes, with page references to the place of treatment of typical errors.

The best thing of all about the book, though, the distinctive thing, is a certain subtle, almost indefinable power of the writer to get details correct and rightly proportioned. Though the book is interesting, there is no attempt at the sort of originality that leads to eccentricity. The author realizes that freshness must go hand in hand with pitiless accuracy. On this score of correctness

the book will stand the most careful scrutiny. In fact the teacher comes from the hard test of class-room use of the book with renewed respect for the soundness of its materials and theory.

JAMES ROUTH.

Oglethorpe University.

Vatnsdœla Saga. Herausgegeben von WALTHER HEINRICH VOGT. Halle a. S., Niemeyer, 1921.

This book forms No. 16 of the well-known series *Altnordische Saga-Bibliothek,* edited by Cederschiöld, Gering, and Mogk. Their names furnish a guarantee that the work is done in a competent fashion. This volume makes no exception, the following strictures to the contrary notwithstanding.

It will be observed at the outset that the needs of a critical edition are not satisfied, for the simple reason that Vogt omits to print the pertinent pieces of *Landnáma,* the *Membrane Fgt.* A. M. 445 b, 4°, and the corresponding passage of the *Younger Melabók.* Yet this would have been a matter of only a score or so of pages. For purposes of comparison we shall therefore have to turn to the excellent edition of the saga by Vigfusson and Möbius in their *Fornsögur* (1860). The present writer, for one, is not convinced that a thorough-going re-examination of the MS. relations—rather than the scattered comparison of readings made by Vogt—is unnecessary. In his opinion, Vogt's conclusion that both the Fragment and the passage of the *Younger Melabók* seem older than the saga proper, may need a complete revision.

With respect to other sagas of the North Quarter dealing with personages active in the *Vatnsdœla,* the writer tried to show in an earlier article (*Journal of English and Germanic Philology,* 1912, 61, 209), of whose existence Vogt is to be sure ignorant, that the *Vatnsdœla* must be considered together with the group comprising the *Thórsteinssaga Víkingssonar* and the *Hrólfssaga Gautrekssonar,* in all of which a definite tendency is discernible to vindicate and glorify the ruling family of the Vatnsdal, as against the pretensions of the descendants of Finnbogi, their neighbors to the West, voiced in the *Finnbogasaga.*—Again, in the matter of the folk-

lore elements and the geography of the earlier chapters, the reviewer came to different conclusions. Renewed insistence is not in place here.

The preparation of the copious footnotes evinces great care and much diligence. I gladly acknowledge that I learned much from them. All the more I regret the absence of perspective and the unevenness of appeal shown in them. Some notes seem written for the editor's own information, *e. g.*, those on *lyptingr* p. 23, *lúðr* p. 24; others, on topographical, antiquarian, genealogical details, for the specialist in Old Norse, *e. g.*, the long notes on *bygðarleyfi* p. 53, *Karsnesland* p. 59, *Ásgeir* p. 82, etc.; some again, for the merest beginner, *e. g.*, those on the meaning of *ágætr* p. 1, *orð* p. 2, *mjǫðr* and *mungát* p. 3, *orðvíss* and *langsær* p. 37, *landnorðr* p. 41, *gǫltr* and *fylgja* (vb.) p. 44, *eigi óannara* p. 93, *hundtík* p. 117—to mention only a few. Similarly, fairly easy idioms are translated, while others of considerable difficulty are passed by. In this connection: is it not time to eliminate notes like the one on p. 18, dealing with the remarkable and portentous fact: "die Mutter auf der Seite des jungen Helden gegen den Vater," with copious examples culled from the whole range of Icelandic literature? Such exhibitions serve to render the philologist ridiculous. —No one will, in reason, quarrel with the editor for the insertion of a note on name-giving; but he will then expect examples and explanations of such names, especially cognomens, as do occur—a not overly difficult task, after Lind's and Jónsson's labors in that field. He will be disappointed, for the most part.—To sum up: the aim of the work was not in this respect properly envisaged or defined in the mind of the editor, and he has thus fallen between two stools.

In a number of instances the rendition of words and idioms is unfortunate:

The words commented on p. 11, line 7 are the sententious, terse statement anent a well thought-out plan, so common in the sagas, rather than a wrong-headed way of putting matters.

§ p. 19, line 19: to call Ingemund's and Grim's viking expedition an attempt at "Seepolizei" certainly is a humorous euphemism.

§ p. 41, line 10: *Forvitni er mér á at vita* by no means signifies

"liegt mir auf, quält mich," but "Es ist mir von Interesse zu wissen."

§ p. 53, line 3: *skríða undir skegg þeim* means obviously "to humble one's self, to ask for favors," and not "sich Schutz suchend unter jmds Bart verstecken."—The remainder of the note on this line is irrelevant.

§ p. 55, line 23: *virða menn þik til, at eigi er at gǫrt* ought probably to be translated "it is out of respect for you that nothing has been done about it" and not "setzen es dir auf die Rechnung, dass . . . ."

L. M. HOLLANDER.

Austin, Texas.

James Harrington's *Oceana*. Edited with notes by S. B. LILJEGREN. Lund and Heidelberg (Carl Winter), 1924. Pp. xxiii, 372.

Though an orator of the American Revolution could think of nothing more eulogistic to say of the rhetorical accomplishments of a fallen hero (Gen. Joseph Warren) than that he "wrote like Harrington and spoke like Cicero," it is hardly for the charm of his style that the author of *Oceana* deserves the attention of posterity. But if, of the four chief English political thinkers of the seventeenth century, Harrington is the hardest to read, he is, for his ideas, in some respects the best worth reading; and his significance in the history of political conceptions is of the first order. Yet he has been singularly neglected by historical scholarship. Until the appearance of Mr. H. F. Russell Smith's work in 1914 there existed no competent study of his doctrine and influence; and it has remained for a Swedish scholar to publish the first carefully edited and adequately annotated text of this famous English book. The volume is among the first-fruits of the New Society of Letters at Lund, which promises to become one of the most notable centers of humanistic studies in Europe; and it is preparatory to two further volumes by Professor Liljegren, one dealing with the *Oceana* in general, the other "inquiring into the question called the balance of property and its historical significance in England." The text is that of the original edition of 1656.

The copious notes manifest an extraordinary range of learning and much laborious research in the identification of Harrington's sources and often obscure allusions. In the interest of the utilization of the book by university students in these degenerate days, it would have been useful to translate the quotations from the Greek, Italian and Dutch. The extensive bibliography, designed to "record such books as are important for the understanding of the soil out of which *Oceana* grew," contains a number of titles little known—not all of them closely related to Harrington's work; but there are also some surprising omissions, such as the *De jure regni* of Buchanan (whose *Rerum Scoticarum historia* is mentioned), Milton's political writings, especially the two *Defensiones* and the *Ready and Easy Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth,* and Nedham's *Mercurius Politicus* and *The Case of the Commonwealth of England.* The dates given are sometimes not those of first publication. The omission of an index is the less easy to forgive because of the rich store of valuable citations in the notes, and the general excellence of the volume, which will doubtless long remain the standard edition of the *Oceana.*

Arthur O. Lovejoy.

The Johns Hopkins University.

CORRESPONDENCE

Shelley's Indebtedness to Sir Thomas Lawrence

The evidence offered by his letter to Sir Thomas Lawrence August 17, 1812,[1] and in Hogg's biography of the poet[2] leaves no room for doubt that Shelley in that year was deeply affected by reading Lawrence's *Empire of the Nairs* (1811). But how enduring that influence was, and to what extent it shaped Shelley's later work in verse is not so generally known.

In his *Radicalism of Shelley* (Catholic Education Press, Washington, D. C., June, 1912) Dr. Daniel J. McDonald has made an extended foray into this hitherto unexplored territory. He has shown that there are echoes of the *Nairs* in *Queen Mab* and *Rosalind and Helen.* I should like to press the investigation a bit

[1] Ingpen, *Letters of Percy Bysshe Shelley,* ed. 1914, p. 356.
[2] *Life of Percy Bysshe Shelley,* 1858, II, 314.

further to discover the measure of the influence of this novel upon *Laon and Cythna* (i. e. *The Revolt of Islam*).

Shelley's poem, in its original, unexpurgated form, introduces us to a brother and sister in love with each other in an imagined country where such an affection would be tolerated—a country, in short, like that of the Nairs. The situation is found in Lawrence's novel, in which the father of the two children says: "My son is to marry his sister next week; they are my only children; both myself and their mother are so happy in the match." The narrator of the story then proceeds to observe: "I knew that the ancient Persians were accustomed to marry their sisters, and I would willingly have been present at a wedding, which recalled to my memory the nuptials of Cyrus." [3]

Cythna, in a dramatic moment in Shelley's story, rescues Laon from his foes:

> . . . on my foes a sudden terror came,
> And they fled, scattering—lo! with reinless speed
> A black Tartarian horse of giant frame
> Comes trampling over the dead, the living bleed
> Beneath the hoofs of that tremendous steed,
> On which, like to an Angel, robed in white,
> Sate one waving a sword . . . the Tartar horse
> Paused, and I saw the shape its might which swayed,
> And heard her musical pants, like the sweet source
> Of waters in the desert, as she said,
> "Mount with me Laon, now!"—I rapidly obeyed.[4]

Compare with this, the following passage from *The Empire of the Nairs:* "The galloping of a horse was heard, swift as a dart it shot across the plain; its flowing main (*sic*) whistled in the wind, and the white foam trickled down its sides. Meva, my beloved Meva, then the joy of my heart, sprung from its back, and in speechless ecstasy flung her arms around my neck." [5]

Further on in the story of the Nairs we find that Agalva, chained to a headless corpse, is confined in a tower. The sinister element in this situation (an element which, as Strong [6] has shown always appealed to Shelley) is reproduced in *Laon and Cythna* when Laon, likewise imprisoned in a tower, is made to endure the sight of four corpses, hung from its frieze, and to imagine that one of the four is that of his beloved Cythna.

Here is Lawrence's description of Agalva in her prison: "Her eye, once so clear, so penetrating, now either stared dim and unmeaning in its socket, or half-closed too weak to support the light.

[3] *Empire of the Nairs*, 2d ed., 1811, I, 207.

[4] *Laon and Cythna*, VI, xix, xx. Another source of Shelley's description is probably *Thalaba*, VI, iii-v. He seems to have levied heavily upon Southey for many of his poems from 1813 to 1820.

[5] *Empire of the Nairs*, IV, 236.

[6] *Three Studies in Shelley*, pp. 107-147.

Her lips, pale and blue, betrayed those teeth, which once shone like a row of pearls. All her features wore the livery of death. . . . she waited in vain the removal of the body. In this hot climate, where instant corruption follows death, the body, once so fair and lovely in her eyes, the body of her beloved was now become an unsightly object of disgust." [7]

Compare Shelley's picture of the corpse which Laon imagines is Cythna's:

> A woman's shape, now lank and cold and blue,
> The dwelling of the many-coloured worm,
> Hung there; the white and hollow cheek I drew
> To my dry lips—what radiance did inform
> Those horny eyes? whose was that withered form?
> Alas, alas! it seemed that Cythna's ghost
> Laughed in those looks, and that the flesh was warm
> Within my teeth!—A whirlwind keen as frost
> Then in its sinking gulfs my sickening spirit tossed.[8]

Cythna heads the forces of the liberals against the tyrant and the gathering of the troops is described at length in Shelley's poem.[9] Likewise Samora, in Lawrence's tale, had drawn thousands to her cause. " . . . her [i. e., Samora's] subjects crowded to her banner (it was the standard of the phœnix), numberless as the stars of heaven, as the pebbles of the shore, or the waves of the ocean; and as they passed over Persia, their thousands increased, as the swelling rivers increase from the mountain torrent. Yes, they came like the crowded waves of the ocean, when the dark wind blows from the deep, and rolls the foaming billows over the shore." [10]

Numerous echoes of this passage might be cited from *Laon and Cythna;* for example:

> . . . . . . those millions swept
> Like waves before the tempest . . .[11]
>
> I . . . . . . saw the throng below
> Stream through the gates like foam-wrought waterfalls
> Fed from a thousand storms . . .[12]
>
> I strove, as, drifted on some cataract
> By irresistible streams . . .[13]

Of yet another passage, closely related to the preceding, in *The Empire of the Nairs,* (" this project, like an autumnal blast, drove every hardy adventurer to the Persian frontiers, and warriors, numberless as the leaves of the forest, covered the banks of the Indus,")[14] there are even clearer echoes in *Laon and Cythna:*

[7] *Empire of the Nairs,* IV, 254.
[8] *Laon and Cythna,* III, xxvi.
[9] *Ibid.,* IV, xix-xxv; V, xiv-xviii.
[10] *Empire of the Nairs,* I, 26.
[11] *Laon and Cythna,* VI, iii.
[12] *Ibid.,* VI, iv.
[13] *Ibid.,* VI, vi.
[14] *Empire of the Nairs,* IV, 6.

. . . . the vast clouds fled,
Countless and swift as leaves on autumn's tempest shed [15]
Her voice was as a mountain-stream which sweeps
The withered leaves of Autumn to the lake.[16]
The blasts of Autumn drive the winged seeds
Over the earth.[17]

And it is perhaps unnecessary to add that upon the figure the whole of the magnificent *Ode to the West Wind* was later to be erected.

WALTER EDWIN PECK.

Wesleyan University.

A PRECURSOR OF LOUIS BOUILHET

Unappreciated by the public at the time of its publication in 1854, Louis Bouilhet's *Les Fossiles* was nevertheless one of the few great poems of science produced during the nineteenth century. Flaubert spoke of it as "le seul poème scientifique de toute la littérature française qui soit cependant de la poésie."

M. Fusil has pointed out [1] that Bouilhet's poem has its principal source in Cuvier's *Discours sur les révolutions de la surface du globe,* published in 1822, which offered to the poet an easily adaptable plan: "Ce qui est certain, c'est que nous sommes maintenant au milieu d'une quatrième succession d'animaux terrestres, et qu'après l'âge des reptiles, après celui des paléonthériums, après celui des mammouths, des mastodontes et des mégathériums, est venu l'âge où l'espèce humaine, aidée de quelques animaux domestiques, domine et féconde paisiblement la terre." Bouilhet modified this scheme somewhat, placing man in the fifth age, and imagining a sixth age to come wherein man would be replaced by a superior being. The general frame, however, is the same.

It must be remembered that Bouilhet's work is not merely a sort of outline of natural science, it is also a fine poem containing passages of imaginative power and sweep, in which the general spirit dominates the technical detail.

Without in any way denying that Cuvier's book was the chief inspiration of *Les Fossiles,* we wish to propose another possibility. In 1847, Dr. Alexandre Delaine published a volume of poetry entitled *Hommage lyrique aux sciences naturelles*. The first poem of the volume is "Les Productions de la Terre" [2] and is specifically addressed to contemporary poets. We read there:

[15] *Laon and Cythna,* I, iv.
[16] *Ibid.*, V, liii.
[17] *Ibid.*, IX, xxi.
[1] C. A. Fusil, *La Poésie scientifique de 1750 à nos jours,* 1917.
[2] In the same volume one may find poems on *l'Astronomie, la Géologie, l'Homme, l'Ombre d'Hippocrate,* etc.

Embrassez largement tous les siècles passés,
Montrez la terre, ardente et jeune fiancée,
Aux rayons du soleil doucement balancée,
Se baignant dans les flots de sa molle vapeur
Comme en un océan de vie et de chaleur,
Et, dans son sein où bout une sève féconde,
Portant avec fierté l'œuf multiple du monde.
Puis voyez, par essaims, dans les plaines des airs,
Sur le sol vierge encor, dans l'abîme des mers,
Sous un aspect chétif ou sous forme éclatante,
Eclore, fourmiller l'animal et la plante;
Et tant de fruits divers, d'organisations,
Suivant au gré du ciel mille directions,
Paraissant confondus, de nature ennemie,
Du monde entretenir l'admirable harmonie,
Et grâce au feu, divin sur eux tous descendu,
Conserver chaque espèce et chaque individu.

Here is a text that may possibly have offered to Bouilhet, not a plan, not a clearly divided outline, not technical information, as did Cuvier, but a point of view, a suggestion, an enthusiastic program. Such a text might have served as the initial goad, the original point of departure for a young writer like the author of *Les Fossiles.*

We have no means of determining whether or not this poem was known to Louis Bouilhet. We think it likely, for not long after (Aug. 15, 1849) the combined *l'Artiste, Revue de Paris* commented on Delaine's book in the following terms:

"Un autre philosophe, M. Alexandre Delaine, voué au culte des sciences naturelles avec le sentiment poétique de Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, vient de publier un recueil de vers où il y en a d'excellents. On peut dire qu'en poésie, M. Delaine est de l'école . . . de Voltaire; mais il s'est soumis aux exigences de la forme romantique, celle qui trouve moyen d'écrire, de peindre, de sculpter dans une strophe. M. Delaine est surtout un poète quand il étudie les sciences naturelles."

L'Artiste was one of the periodicals most read by the group of writers to which Bouilhet belonged.

Delaine was a precursor not only of Louis Bouilhet, but also—to a very limited extent—of Leconte de Lisle. It is possible to compare the verses above quoted and some of Leconte de Lisle's poetry. While science in the latter's work usually means erudition, there are passages in his poems—the introduction to *Bhagavat,* for example,—which reveal an understanding of the magnitude and power of animal and vegetable life upon the earth, a realization of the fact that—to use Delaine's formula—"dans son sein où bout une sève féconde, la terre porte avec fierté l'oeuf multiple du monde." To conclude that Delaine had any influence on Leconte de Lisle would be absurd. The former was as much inferior to the latter as a corporal of the grande armée was to Napoleon. It is

also doubtful if Delaine's poetry attracted Bouilhet's attention. But, in any case, it is interesting to know that these poems existed, that in the year 1847 poems celebrating natural science were composed and printed.

ELLIOTT M. GRANT.

Smith College.

"AND ON THE LEFT HAND HELL"

> and now in little space
> The confines met of empyrean Heaven
> And of this World, and on the left hand Hell
> With long reach interpos'd; three several ways
> In sight, to each of these three places led.
>
> *Par. Lost*, x, 322.

The words "and on the left hand Hell" in the passage above quoted have caused a good deal of conjecture among critics. Masson, after proposing a change in the pointing, and the understanding of "interpos'd" as a reflexive verb, acknowledges that he cannot account for these five words except by supposing that Milton thought of Satan as having first alighted on the left or sinister side of the world, and of Sin and Death as having consequently built the bridge "pontifical" to that point.

The obscurity arose from Masson's misunderstanding of Milton's conception of universal space. This misunderstanding has been shared by all modern editors of Milton, with one exception, and by Orchard in his book on Milton's astronomy. As a matter of fact Milton did not think of Hell as hollowed out of the nadir portion of Chaos, but as situated to the left of the mundus (earth, with its enveloping spheres) a distance equal to three times the length of the radius of the world (*Par. Lost*, I, 74).

For this sinister position of Hell, Milton's authority has hitherto been doubtful. In Newton's variorum edition two possible, but not very convincing, reasons are suggested. The first is a reference to *Matt.* xxv, 41 "Then shall he say unto them on his left hand." The other is a reminder that Vergil (*Aen.* VI, 542) put Hell on the left of Elysium. A more striking precedent Milton may have found in rabbinical tradition. In the *Midrash Tehillim* xc. it is expressly stated that Hell (Gehenna) is on the left hand of God.

With this Jewish exegetical treatise on the Old Testament it is entirely possible that Milton was acquainted, since it was published long before his time. From boyhood he possessed a reading knowledge of Hebrew, and could read readily enough the unpointed text of the *Midrashim*. Indeed there are many indications that Milton not infrequently wandered rather far afield into the by-ways of Hebrew book-land.

University of Illinois. EDWARD CHAUNCEY BALDWIN.

WORDSWORTH'S *Happy Warrior* AND HERBERT'S *Constancy*

In Emerson's *Journals,* v, 13, we find the following entry:

> Herbert's piece called "Constancy" is noble, and seems to have suggested Wordsworth's "Happy Warrior."

In *Poems of Henry Vaughan,* edited by E. K. Chambers, I, 315, we find the following note, on Vaughan's *Righteousness:*

> The debt of Wordsworth's *Ode on the Imitations* [*sic*] *of Immortality* to Vaughan's *Retreat* has been often discussed, but surely his *Character of the Happy Warrior* owes at least as much to the present poem, which in its turn is modelled on Herbert's *Constancy* (p. 97).

After comparing the three poems in question, I have reached the conclusion that Emerson is nearer the truth than is E. K. Chambers. So far as the subject-matter of the *Happy Warrior* is concerned, it is not plain that Wordsworth borrowed much, if anything, from either of the other poems. As regards form, however, he almost certainly borrowed something from Herbert's *Constancy.* This can best be seen by comparing the introductions and the conclusions of the three poems. Vaughan has (*Poems,* ed. E. K. Chambers, I, 256-258):

> Fair, solitary path! whose blessed shades
> The old, white prophets planted first and dress'd;
> Leaving for us—whose goodness quickly fades,—
> A shelter all the way, and bowers to rest;
>
> Who is the man that walks in thee? who loves
> Heav'n's secret solitude, those fair abodes
> Where turtles build, and careless sparrows move,
> Without to-morrow's evils and future loads?
>
> Who hath the upright heart, the single eye,
> The clean, pure hand, which never meddled pitch?
> Who sees invisibles, and doth comply
> With hidden treasures that make truly rich?
>
> . . . .
>
> Who doth thus, and doth not
> These good deeds blot
> With bad, or with neglect; and heaps not wrath
> By secret filth, nor feeds
> Some snake, or weeds,
> Cheating himself; that man walks in this path.

Herbert has (*The Life and Works of George Herbert,* ed. G. H. Palmer, III, 119-121):

> Who is the honest man?
>
> . . . .
>
> This is the Mark-man, safe and sure,
> Who still is right, and prayes to be so still.

Wordsworth has (*Poetical Works,* ed. Dowden, IV, 228-230):

> Who is the happy Warrior? Who is he

> That every man in arms should wish to be?
>
> . . . .
>
> This is the happy Warrior; this is He
> That every Man in arms should wish to be.

The calm elaborateness of the introduction and conclusion of Vaughan's poem contrasts strikingly with the directness, brevity, and forcefulness of the corresponding parts of the other two. Moreover, the lines from Wordsworth suggest strongly that they are echoes of the lines from Herbert. The latter's *Mark-man* may even have suggested Wordsworth's *Warrior.*

It is likely, therefore, that Emerson, rather than E. K. Chambers, is right. This does not, however, preclude the possibility of Wordsworth's having been acquainted with both the earlier poems.

THEODORE T. STENBERG.

University of Texas.

A NOTE ON *Faerie Queene* IV. iii. 27

One of the earliest specific references in the *Faerie Queene* to Spenser's Irish environment is found in Book IV, canto iii, stanza 27, in which the fluctuating fortunes of the combat between Cambell and Triamond are compared to the strong tide in the river Shannon.

> Like as the tide, that comes fro th' ocean mayne,
> Flowes up the Shenan with contrarie forse,
> And overruling him in his owne rayne,
> Drives back the current of his kindly course,
> And makes it seeme to have some other sourse:
> But when the floud is spent, then backe againe,
> His borrowed waters forst to redisbourse,
> He sends the sea his owne with double gaine,
> And tribute eke withall, as to his soveraine.

Contemporary evidence as to the force of these tides seems to be lacking; but a brief notice in the *Annals of Loch Cé,* one of the better known of the Irish chronicles, under the year 1586, may be significant:

> "The stream of the Sionainn (Shannon) turned back to Loch-Righ (Lough-Ree); and it was twenty-four hours in that order, in the presence of all who were in Ath-Luain (Athlone)." [1]

May it be that this elaborate simile of Spenser's had its origin in the impression made on the poet's mind not by a daily though impressive phenomenon, but by an unusual and marvellous event, the memory of which was still fresh in the south of Ireland?

F. F. COVINGTON, JR.

University of Texas.

[1] *Rolls Series,* edited and translated by W. M. Hennessy, 1871, II, 475.

BRIEF MENTION

Those who are interested in Folklore, especially in its relation to History, will welcome the appearance in this field of a new journal: *Jahrbuch für historische Volkskunde. Herausgegeben von* Wilhelm Fraenger. I. Band. *Die Volkskunde und ihre Grenzgebiete. Mit* 206 *Abbildungen.* Berlin. Herbert Stubenrauch, 1925. 348 pp. 14 M. The editor justifies the creation of a new organ for the science of Folklore in the face of the long approved journals which are concerned with the entire field of folklore studies, by the fact that it appropriates at the outset a special task. With explicit limitation of the sphere of its contents it designates itself as Year Book for historical Folklore. The editor states succinctly that it seeks in four ways to accomplish the historical statement expressed in the title. The first way aims at making Folklore as such the object of historical consideration and to exhibit its scientific history from its beginning in the period of Humanism to the legacy of Romanticism, in systematically constructed separate volumes. With this is connected the second way, further reaching historically, which strives for a dissemination of the primary documents of this science. The third way will lead to an appreciation of those popular personages, who like Johannes Fischart or Pieter Bruegel, like Abraham a Santa Clara or Jeremias Gotthelf, who conceal in their works a summary of the popular forms of life. The fourth way takes as its starting-point out of the materials of the science of Folklore the three special domains: folk-poetry, architecture, and imagery. The editor adds, the present first volume is in so far the preliminary step to the future ones as it—dedicated to methodological discussions—in fundamental as well as in practical treatises will point out the way to the productive coöperation of Folklore with its neighboring sciences.

The contents of this first volume consist of nine articles and a chapter of critical bibliography. The articles are distributed among the five following topics: Pre-historical times, History of religion, Historical jurisprudence, Literary history, History of Art. This brief summary of the field involved gives no idea of the extraordinary wealth of material in the individual articles, of the most diversified character, I can mention briefly only a few of the most general interest. Johannes Bolte contributes an entertaining account of fortune-telling books from the earliest times to the present day and prints as an appendix a Netherlandish fortune-telling book of the fourteenth century. The editor, Wilhelm Fraenger gives a fully illustrated paper on the early history

of the pictorial broadsides issued by the printing house of the Kühns at Neuruppin in Prussia, chiefly in the early part of the last century. Of even greater historical and pictorial interest is the article by Hans Fehr "Das Stadtvolk im Spiegel des Augsburger Eidbuches." The volume in question completed in 1583 by the calligrapher Hans Luzenberger, and illustrated by some one hundred and sixty miniatures by an unknown painter, contains formulas for the oaths required by the city from its various classes of citizens. Each formula is illustrated by a miniature reproduced in the article.

Of unusual value and interest is Hans Naumann's introduction to comparative Folklore and the history of Religion. It would be difficult to find in the same space, pp. 19-37, so admirable an account of a great field of study, just now occupying the earnest attention of scholars. A greater wealth of material, if possible, is found in Freiherr von Künssberg's two articles on "Rechtsgeschichte und Volkskunde," and "Hühnerrecht und Hühnerzauber." The latter article deals with the curious prescriptions limiting the distance that fowls may wander from their houses, and the magic spells to keep them at home. Usually the distance was as far as a hammer or sickle could be thrown.

I have said enough, I trust, to show the unusual value and wide range of interest of this newcomer into the field of Folklore. The first volume amply justifies its creation and it is to be hoped that an unbroken succession of equally valuable ones follow it. The one before us is certainly a splendid monument of scholarship and does honor in every way to the publisher and printer.

T. F. C.

The Pilgrimage of Robert Langton. Transcribed with an Introduction and Notes by E. M. Blackie, B. A. (Harvard University Press, 1924). This volume—handsomely printed "under the supervision of Bruce Rogers"—is a reprint of the only known copy recently discovered in the Library of Lincoln Cathedral. In it is related Langton's pilgrimage to Compostella and other shrines, presumably in the first quarter of the sixteenth century (the book appeared in 1522). It is difficult to imagine a more uncritical mind, especially in that age of shifting views. As noted by the editor (in a good introduction) Langton's credulity concerning relics is greater than that revealed in the *Canterbury Tales.* Yet, though probably of a dull mind, he was not an illiterate person. A nephew of the Bishop of Winchester, he held various ecclesiastical offices; he was even Archdeacon of Dorset (1486-1514) and Treasurer of York Minster (1509-1514). That the English Church at that time should have had an "ecclesiastic

of the most conventional type"—"his attitude was only that of most of his contemporaries"—should bring a small measure of comfort in these latter days.

Presumably a slip was made in reprinting the colophon: MCCCCXXII instead of MCCCCCXXII (cf. Introd., viii). An interesting word is "inconsutyll" (p. 38): *NED* gives but one example (1657).

E. P. K.

Die primären Interjektionen in den indogermanischen Sprachen. Von Ernst Schwentner (Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1924). In the space of 55 pages, which the author states were written as a *Habilitationsschrift,* is brought together an enormous amount of material on interjections culled from dictionaries and grammars, and carefully and clearly arranged. After a brief introduction on the nature of primary (*ach, oh,* etc.) and secondary (*me hercle, mein Gott, my goodness*) interjections, the author begins by taking up the purely vocalic interjections, such as: Greek ἆ, Germ. *ah;* Greek ἰώ, ἰού, Lat. *io,* MHG. *jû;* Sanskr. *ā,* Greek ἦ, French *eh;* Lat. *au,* NHG. *au,* etc. Then follow the purely consonantal, such as: *st!, pst!, hm!;* those composed of vowel and consonant and vice versa: Germ. *ach,* Sanskr. *ām* etc; Greek ἆ, Lat., Engl. *ha;* Sanskr., Lat., Engl. *hō;* Sanskr. *hē,* French *hé;* Lat., Germ. *hei;* Lat. *hoi, hui;* then those composed of vowel + cons. + vowel as Sanskr. *ayē* etc.; cons. + vowel + cons. as Sanskr. *has,* Lat. *heus, hem;* and finally those formed with the letter *l,* as Sanskr. *halahalā,* Greek ἐλελεῦ, Germ. *holla halloh,* French *hélas* etc. Chapter 4 is devoted to a discussion of the onomatopoetic interjections; chapter 5 to the enticing-, shooing-, and teamster-calls.

In the remaining pages the author touches briefly upon the grammatical structure and analysis of the primary interjections and upon their employment in the formation of words. As for example, in Greek there are a large number of interjections from which *io* present verbs have been formed, e. g.: ὤζω–ὤ, ψιττάζω–ψίττα, μύζω–μύ. In Latin such verbs are not so readily apparent, cf.: *mūgīre, ululāre.* In German the verbs of interjectional origin are more easily recognized, especially those formed with the iterative and intensive suffix *-zen: ächzen, jauchzen, glucksen,* etc.; from onomatopoetic interjections are formed: *plumpsen, paffen, puffen,* etc. In the Slavic languages such formations are exceedingly numerous.

The work is thorough and exceedingly well done, and a complete word-index enhances its usefulness.

E. H. S.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XL MAY, 1925 NUMBER 5

FURTHER EVIDENCE OF REALISM IN THE FRENCH NOVEL OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.[1]

In no branch of literary criticism is the exact definition of terms so essential as in the discussion of realism. Sauvageot's [2] description of realism is, as he himself admits, theoretical and has no complete application in French literature. He says: "Le réalisme est un système qui astreint l'art à reproduire la réalité sensible telle que l'experience la fait connaître." Such is the theory. In point of fact we find that for example in the novel, which is the immediate subject of our remarks, realism has a much more restricted definition. The realist novelist aims at the reproduction of *unidealised* nature. In selecting his subjects he is naturally led to prefer the ugly to the beautiful so that the life which he describes is usually that of the poorer classes of society since here he is not likely to have the unity of his picture complicated by idealistic elements. It is true that even a naturalistic writer like Edmond de Goncourt discussed the possibility of what he calls *la réalité élégante* and actually produced a novel *Chérie* [3] which purported to be a realistic picture of the life of a young girl "observée dans le milieu des élégances et des richesses, du pouvoir de la suprême bonne compagnie." But from the very fact that he deliberately chooses as his subject what is admittedly an exceptional and *ideal* milieu he ceases to be a realist in the restricted and com-

[1] See previous article on this subject: Green;—"Realism in the French novel in the first half of the XVIIIth century," *M. L. N.*, XXXVIII, No. 6.

[2] David Sauvageot: *Le réalisme et le naturalisme dans la littérature et dans l'art*, Paris, 1890.

[3] Paris, 1884.

monly accepted sense of the term and becomes the painter of the *moeurs* of high society.

Now all the critics, in discussing the origins of the French realist school of novelists which made its appearance about the middle of the nineteenth century, agree in the following particulars. The realist school is, they say, a reaction against the exaggerated romanticism of the school which immediately preceded it and they point to the progress made by science and positivism after 1850 as arguments in favour of the rapid development of realism in the novel. All this is irrefutable yet unsatisfactory. Realism did not, Topsy-like, "just grow" and the object of this article is to show that there was throughout the eighteenth century a steady undercurrent of realism in the French novel.

Let us first examine the attitude of the eighteenth century critics towards the realist novel of their period. Desfontaines and Voltaire are prepared to encourage a greater respect for *vraisemblance* both in the novel and in the theatre but with distinct reserves. When de la Place in his *Théâtre Anglais* defends Shakespeare's action in introducing common people into his plays he does so on the ground that they "représentent le naturel" which elicits from Desfontaines the exclamation "Mais tout ce qui est naturel, est-il beau, est-il agréable? N'est-ce pas s'avilir que de prendre plaisir à entendre parler des *fossoyeurs* et des *savetiers* . . . ?"[4] In reply to an objection that, notwithstanding such methods Shakespeare had held the stage for one hundred and fifty years Desfontaines merely remarks that this shows that there are more *peuple* in England than in France and that the taste of this class is notoriously low.

In 1744, the Président Caulet launched an attack on novels in general, all of which he would suppress if he could.[5] He is, however, good enough to admit that the novel of his time has increased in probability. He complains, nevertheless, that the *merveilleux dans les faits* has given way to the *merveilleux dans les caractères.* Sentiment and passion are over emphasized. The beneficent fairy of the old time novel no longer appears, it is true, but too often

[4] *Jugements sur quelques ouvrages nouveaux,* tome IX, p. 3.

[5] *Receuil des pièces d'éloquence et de poésie qui ont remporté les prix des Jeux Floraux en cette année 1745.* Cited in *Jugements* t. XI, p. 104.

the novel hero is extricated from one impossible situation by the simple expedient of plunging him into another and more improbable one.

Desfontaines' remarks are illuminating. He maliciously assumes that Caulet in his sweeping generalisations is condemning the novels of Marivaux, Prévost and Crébillon fils. There are, however, he suggests other novels, "surtout ceux où il ne s'agit point de galanterie et qui représentent ce qui se passe dans la vie commune." One might conclude from this that he is defending the realist novel did he not himself disillusion us. In his appreciation of that too little known classic *Les mémoires du comte de Comminge,* he says:[6] "L'auteur, plein de respect pour son lecteur ne le conduit que dans les lieux honnêtes et jamais parmi des gens de la lie du peuple pour le régaler sottement de leur jargon et de leurs plats quolibets. Tous ses personnages sont nobles: rien de bas, rien de bourgeois dans ses peintures." This was in 1735 and it is most probable that Desfontaines was hitting at de Mouhy and Marivaux.

Some years later, on the appearance of Prévost's translation of Richardson's *Pamela* in 1742 the same critic reveals to what a degree the French literature of his time was aristocratic. He paradoxically praises Richardson for omitting "le jargon dégoûtant d'un bas domestique ou d'un homme de la lie du peuple.' Si un domestique y parle, c'est simplement et raisonnablement car le bon sens est de tous les états et il plaît dans la bouche de quelque personnage que ce soit pourvu qu'il ne soit pas avili par des pensées qui sentent trop le bas peuple et qu'un honnête homme n'entend pas volontiers."[7] In other words, he does not object to servants in novels if they speak like gentlemen, a small concession to realism at the expense of probability. However, the descriptions of Mr. B's attempts on Pamela's chastity are too realistic not to disturb Desfontaines though his objections, be it noted, are based on moral rather than on esthetic grounds. "Les attentats de Milord offrent nécessairement quelques images un peu hardies qui allarment d'abord mais qui ne laissent aucune impression dangereuse."

It is interesting from the point of view of realism to compare

[6] *Observations sur les écrits modernes,* t. II, p. 257.
[7] *Ibid.,* t. XXIX, p. 70 and p. 206.

Prévost's translations with the original novels of Richardson. The Frenchman's modifications and omissions are all inspired by a desire to mitigate the realism of the English models. For example, in the introduction to the translation of *Pamela,* Prévost points out that the English language is not so "châtiée" as his own. "On souffre dans celle-là des expressions qu'on ne souffrirait pas dans celle-ci." The brutality of Mr. B's speeches to Pamela is considerably toned down. In *Clarissa Harlowe* he adopts the same procedure excusing himself on the ground that "depuis vingt ans que la littérature anglaise est connue à Paris, on sait que pour s'y faire naturaliser, elle a souvent besoin de ces petites réparations." [8] Even the immaculate *Grandisson* has to be purged of certain too realistic passages. "J'ai supprimé ou réduit aux usages communs de l'Europe ce que ceux de l'Angleterre peuvent avoir de choquant pour les autres nations. Il m'a semblé que ces restes de l'ancienne grossièreté britannique sur lesquels il n'y a que l'habitude qui puisse encore fermer les yeux aux Anglais, déshonoreraient un livre où la politesse doit aller de pair avec la noblesse et la vertu." [9]

An observation regarding Fielding's *Amelia* in the *Correspondance littéraire de Raynal, Grimm, Diderot et Meister* is illuminating.[10] Why are there not in French literature, asks the critic, domestic novels like those of Fielding? He concludes that this phenomenon is due not to any lack of competent novelists but rather to the want of subject matter. "Quand on a peint nos petits maîtres et nos petites maîtresses" he continues, "on a à peu près épuisé la matière et mis tout le national qu'il est possible de mettre dans un roman français. Tels sont les ouvrages de M. Crébillon fils qu'on pourrait proprement appeler les romans domestiques de la nation." In this connection he mentions *Le Voyage de Mantes* which is by the way a most realistic picture of French lower middle class life.[11] From his remarks on this novel he indicates quite plainly the current attitude towards works of

[8] Introduction to his translation of *Clarissa Harlowe*, 1751.

[9] Introduction to his translation of *Grandisson*, 1755.

[10] Tome II, p. 267 (1753).

[11] See my *La peinture des moeurs de la bonne société dans le roman français de 1715 à 1761*, p. 148.

this kind. "Voilà donc un roman domestique que personne cependant ne saurait; c'est qu'indépendamment du défaut de talent dans l'auteur, les personnages du roman sont tous des gens qui n'ont point d'existence dans la société et dont les aventures par conséquent ne sauraient nous attacher. Le quartier de la Halle et de la place Maubert a sans doute ses moeurs, et très marquées même, mais ce ne sont pas les moeurs de la nation. Elles ne méritent donc pas d'être peintes. . ."

When Mme Puisieux's translation of *Amélia* appeared in 1763 we learn that it had no success.[12] "Personne ne l'a lu; les femmes en ont dit des horreurs." The writer praises, however, the *vraisemblance* of Fielding's characters who resemble the everyday man. Of the realism of the scene in the *mauvais lieu,* for instance, he says nothing but it is easy to see that it was precisely this sort of writing which so horrified the susceptible French ladies.

Accordingly to the Goncourts, the truly realist novel must be *documentaire* and it is well known that Flaubert's *Madame Bovary* was founded on actual fact. There are several examples of this procedure in the French novel of the eighteenth century. Thus the actress Clairon is the heroine of a novel by G. de la Bataille.[13] De Mouhy used the adventures of Anne de Moras, comtesse de Courbon as material for one of his stories[14] while Mauvillon's *Le soldat parvenu*[15] was based on actual fact. Again; Fréron informs us that d'Arnaud's *Les Epoux malheureux* is another example of documentation. "C'est une histoire véritable et récente et qui vient de se passer sous nos yeux."[16] It is the history of

[12] *Corr. litt.*, etc., t. 5.

[13] *Histoire de la vie de Mlle. Cronel*, 1739; see *Peinture des moeurs*, etc., p. 135.

[14] *Mémoires d'Anne de Moras*, etc.; La Haye, 1739-1740. See *Peinture des moeurs*, etc., p. 134.

[15] *Le soldat parvenu ou les mémoires de M. de Verval dit Belle-Rose*, Dresde, 1735. See *Peinture des moeurs*, etc., p. 138.

[16] *Lettres de Mme la comtesse de . . . sur quelques écrits modernes*, Genève, 1746. It is interesting to note as an early example of documentation in the French novel *Les Egarements des passions*, etc., Paris, 1697. Of this work Boudot says: "Ce livre contient XIX aventures dont la Xe est l'histoire de la femme d'un papetier de la rue St. Jacques nommé Depuy et mère de M. Depuy intendant au Canada" (Bib. L'Arsénal, MS. 7067).

Mme de la Bedoyère who was an actress at the Théâtre des Italiens.

We shall see, however, that despite the existence of a considerable body of opinion opposed to realism in the novel, there is a steadily growing current of realist fiction in the eighteenth century. Let us now examine, then, some examples of novels of this sort published between 1731 and 1781.

That pioneer of realism in the French novel of the nineteenth century, Champfleury, remarks:[17] "A mon sens Challes est le premier qui ait employé la réalité absolue dans le roman. Tous ses personnages sont de petits nobles ou des bourgeoises du temps. Ils parlent le langage de leur époque; ils portent des noms de la fin du XVIIe siècle. Enfin, ils donnent une peinture fidèle des moeurs d'alors." Now, an examination of Challes' *Illustres Françaises*[18] will show us that Champfleury exaggerates. It is true that Challes, like Lesage and Marivaux, ably represents the new movement which tended towards a closer observance of probability in the novel. But we must be on our guard always against the specious promises which Challes and so many of his contemporaries hold out in their prefaces. The usual practice of such novelists is to claim in their introduction that they are merely relating something which has actually occurred and which therefore must be perfectly probable. Says Challes: "J'ai affecté la simple vérité. Si j'avais voulu, j'aurais embelli le tout par des aventures de commande mais je n'ai rien voulu dire qui ne fût vrai et s'il y a quelque chose qui puisse paraître fabuleux ce sera l'action de Du Puis qui se perce le corps dans la chambre de Madame de Londé; cependant je n'ai pas dû le taire puisqu'elle est vrai." Strange to say, despite this naïve attempt at "suggestion," the reader is not always convinced of the probability of many of the incidents related in the *Illustres Françaises*. It must, however, be conceded that there are flashes of realism in these *contes*, but it is an exaggerated and brutal realism which betrays its picaresque origin. Here is a specimen of his manner. One of the characters, Des Francs, is bathing with a friend near the Pont neuf. A soldier throws down some filth which strikes Des Francs on the face. This is what ensues. "Vous en riez et qui n'en rirait? Les

[17] *Le réalisme*, 1857.

[18] 1713. See also his *Histoires françoises, galantes et comiques*, 1712.

regardants en rirent aussi. Je n'en ris pas moi. Je plongeai pour me nettoyer et, coupant entre les bateaux, je vins prendre terre au-dessous des degrés. Je les montai nu et à la merci des coups de fouet des charretiers qui ne me les épargnèrent point. Je passai sur le Pont Neuf et tombai côte à côte sur mon coquin de soldat qui croyait en être quitte. Je le pris par les cheveux, je lui donnai trois ou quatre coups de poing sur le nez et le jetai du haut du pont dans la rivière où je me jetai après lui. La surprise que mon action lui avait causée et une si grande chute l'avait étourdi. Ses habits l'entraînaient au fond de l'eau et si on n'avait été à son secours c'était un soldat noyé."

Mme Meheust's *Histoire d'Emilie* [19] is a frank protest against the idealism of the *Clélie* type of love story. It is the account of the infatuation of a low-born girl for a man some years her senior. Emilie, though brought up on the impossibly romantic fiction of the *Hypolite* brand, scandalises her mother's friends by bursting out laughing at their naïve fondness for such literature. Saint Hilaire, with whom she falls in love, never suspecting that this child, as she seems to him, is capable of a 'grande passion,' brings her little gifts from the Foire Saint Laurent. Emilie, enraged at his obtuseness, one day throws the presents at him and blurts out: "N'auriez-vous jamais que ces badineries à me donner?" She then suggests that he should 'lend her his heart for twenty-four hours.' The result is that the mother discovers the affair and bundles off her precocious daughter to a convent. The romantic Saint Hilaire puts up at a village near by and for two days prowls round the nunnery, becoming of course, a marked man. In the words of the disgusted Emilie: "A quoi servit cette fantaisie qu'on peut nommer espagnole? A quoi servit-elle? A me faire observer davantage. Un homme fait et vêtu comme était M. de Saint Hilaire attira les regards des villageois et pour surcroît de malheur une soeur tourière, curieuse et alerte, examina soigneusement les démarches du très affligé cavalier. Cette soeur avertit la portière qui le redit à la mère des pensionnaires et celle-ci va le conter à la supérieure. Conseil extraordinairement assemblé, grande rumeur parmi les béates. Cet homme en veut à une des pensionnaires. Tout est perdu." The locksmith is called in but

[19] *Histoire d'Emilie ou les amours de Mlle. . . .* , Paris, 1732.

is laughed at in the proverbial way since Emilie establishes communication with her lover through the servant of a mutual friend, one of the *pensionnaires.*

L'histoire de Gogo[20] is a realistic account of the adventures of a servant girl in the underworld of Paris. On the death of her parents the heroine, Gogo, is left to the tender mercies of an avaricious aunt who retains the girl's small fortune and hands her over to a devout old harpy with an extremely shady past. The girl is deprived of her liberty and becomes a drudge. One day, however, a neighbor, the wife of a *procureur,* hearing Gogo sing asks her mistress to allow the servant to visit her. The old harridan consents, calculating that the *procureur* may help her with a lawsuit in which she is involved. Gogo meets the lawyer's nephew with whom she falls violently in love. "Le reste de cette soirée," she says, "je ne vis les actions des autres hors celles de mon amant qu'à travers un nuage." Her main idea is now to meet her lover clandestinely but as a result of a scene with her mistress, she is forbidden to leave the house. Whilst brooding in her attic, 'looking at the sky and the tiles,' she suddenly sees her lover, Gerville, setting a trap for sparrows on the roof. Terrified lest he should go without seeing her, she seizes a jug of water and leaning out at the window pours it into the gutter between the houses. Gerville looks up, sees her and comes over into her room. Gogo's joy is clouded by the thought that she may be released from her welcome confinement so she contrives to be caught pretending to escape and is of course again shut up in her room. Here the author interjects: "Quelques gens de mauvaise humeur diront peut-être. Il entre ici trop de réflexion; cela n'est pas vraisemblable. Quelle apparence qu'une jeune fille pense ainsi à tout? Mais je renvoie ces incrédules à celles qui, comme moi, ont aimé."

The procureur's family moves taking Gerville with them. A bogus baroness comes to live in their house and on the strength of a false engagement persuades Gogo to allow herself to be seduced by an accomplice, the marquis de Blenci. Gogo writes to Gerville confessing everything and the two go off to Lyons. Gerville is however recaptured by his parents and sent to the navy.

Gogo turns adventuress and arrives in Paris. After a disrepu-

[20] La Haye, 1739, anonymous.

table adventure with an old financier she seduces the latter's young nephew. The police now take the affair in hand and she is forced to change her name. By the merest accident she hears at her dressmaker's that a *lettre de cachet* is out against her. It happens that the wife of the policeman who is deputed to arrest her is gossiping with the dressmaker when Gogo arrives. I quote the passage as an example of realist description and because it is an admirable picture of the *moeurs* of a class not usually described in the literature of the time outside the reports of the Hôpital prison.

"La femme de l'exempt dans cette intervalle se tenait debout et lorsque je fus assise, voyant qu'on ne lui disait pas d'en faire autant, elle y resta encore. Malgré l'attention que portait ma couturière à ce que je lui disais, elle ne put s'empêcher de lui dire: 'Hé bien, mademoiselle, vous vous en allez donc?' (façon de la congédier assez cavalière) qu'elle interpréta néanmoins comme une invitation de prendre part à la conversation et afin d'y fournir par ce qu'elle crut de plus intéressant. 'Ah! mon dieu, oui' dit-elle, en se rasseyant, 'je ne peux rester plus longtemps. Poussant, (c'était le nom de son mari) veut souper et se coucher de bonne heure pour être en état d'aller demain donner le reveil-matin à une bonne dame qui se passerait bien de la visite. . . . Ce sont de ces marquises, comtesses, baronnes, veuves d'officiers dont il y en a plus à l'Hôpital qu'il n'en reste de véritables dans tout le royaume: de ces tripots, brelans ou comme il vous plaira leur donner le nom car cela peut porter celui qu'on veut pourvu qu'il soit vilain et je ne doute point que Madame ne soit trop intéressée à voir punir ces coquines pour les plaindre. Vous voyez installer cela avec quatre tables de quadrille, une méchante tapisserie, deux sixains de cartes, un laquais, une femme de chambre à la marque pour les jours de bonne compagnie, une nièce ou voisine jolie cela vous rafle toute la jeunesse d'un quartier et le peu qui restent d'honnêtes personnes se trouvent vis à vis de rien. Ce n'est pas que je parle pour moi car nous ne sommes pas assez grosse dame' (ce qu'elle continuait d'un ton à ne pas laisser douter qu'elle n'était pas toujours si modeste), 'mais l'on entend parler ses voisines et l'on sait où elles en sont. Il ne faut qu'approcher de ces choses pour en être scandalisée. Nous en avons comme cela de

nouvellement venues dans notre maison. Cela crie vengeance. Vous ne voyez que fiacres, brouettes, porteurs, plumets, abbés, rotisseurs—c'est un vacarme perpétuel. Si on était *langues* voyez, je vous prie, à quoi des misérables comme cela seraient exposées mais ces drôlesses-là ont souvent aveo elles de fâcheuses suites et l'on est encore contrainte de se taire par charité."

Gogo escapes and again meets the baroness who gives her a vivid description of her early struggles against poverty and of her life as a *cocotte.* Exploited by an unscrupulous accomplice she became his procuress and for twelve years carried on her vile trade amongst "les petites filles brodeuses, couturières, raccommodeuses de dentelles, faiseuses de pompons, de paniers et d'autres brimborions." Wealthy now and a woman of fashion she takes Gogo under her wing and launches her on a stage career.

Villaret's *La belle Allemande* (1745) is a good example of didactic realism. The heroine, speaking of the valets and artisans who figure on the copious list of her lovers, says: "Ces vils mortels, pour occuper les derniers rangs de la société n'en sont pas pour cela des objets moins dignes d'attention; d'autant plus propres à nous instruire que chez eux les vices grossiers et tout nus s'y montrent à découvert sans que les yeux puissent être fascinés par ces dehors imposteurs qui couvrent souvent le même fonds dans un monde plus poli." There is just one glimpse of idealism when the heroine, Thérèse, to her mother's disgust falls in love with a decent man who is willing to forget the past and to send her to a nunnery till their marriage. However, Villaret's sense of realism rebels at this dénouement and the lover is forced by parental pressure and by fear of losing his position to give up Thérèse who is reclaimed by her mother and settled in the harem of a rich financier.

I have previously indicated the importance of Caylus [21] in the history of realism. A remark by Raynal [22] is interesting in this connection. "Le comte de Caylus, M. de Maurepas et quelques autres ont commencé il y a quelques années à écrire du style du peuple et sur les moeurs du peuple. Ce genre est tombé depuis à M. de Vadé qui vient de s'élever à la poésie. Il a publié un

[21] *Modern Language Notes*, XXXVIII, No. 6, p. 324.

[22] *Correspondance de Grimm*, etc., t. II, p. 40 (1751).

poème intitulé *La Pipe cassée*." Raynal, of course, condemns the tendency, but Caylus, whose favourite field was the Halles, became an expert in the use of the popular dialect and founded *la littérature poissarde*. His *Lettres de la Grenouillère* and his *Fêtes roulantes* [23] are illuminating and sympathetic etchings of the life of the Parisian plebs though marred by a too great insistence on the Rabelaisian aspect of his subject.

It is unnecessary even in a study of this sort to enter into an analysis of *Les plaisirs secrets d'Angélique*.[24] Let it suffice to say that we have here an example of the grossest realism which it is possible to find in a narrative occupied with the study of sex relations.

A good example of documentation in the novel is Guer's *Pinolet* [25] the story of the life of a blind man who was a well known Parisian character. Guer, while admitting that to be truly realistic, an author must make his characters speak their natural language, excuses himself on the grounds that he does not know patois. Since, then, he cannot be absolutely accurate, he prefers not to pretend to be so at all. His grasp of peasant psychology reminds one of de Maupassant. Pinolet says: "A la campagne surtout, on n'aime pas les personnages inutiles. Le paysan, comme les gens de coeur, fuit les objets dégoûtants. Grondé des uns, battu par les autres je me trouvais fort embarrassé de ma figure." There is a reversion to the realism of the picaresque sort in the description of Pinolet's abduction by a villainous beggar, Jean Valois, but Guer has the faculty of extracting realism from the most insignificant incidents. The blind man seldom meets with kindness. Children put soot in his bowl and filth on his bread. He excites the envy of local blind men in the villages where he stops. On the whole Guer's outlook is extremely pessimistic and his novel is really an indictment of the sordid materialism of the French peasant. In this connection let me mention in passing Des Bies' *Nine* [26] which though for the most part a romantic novel contains some realistic pictures of peasant life.

[23] Approximately 1747.

[24] Londres, 1751. Seized by police. According to d'Hémery, chief of police, it is by l'abbé de la Suze. Le marquis de Paulmy however attributes it to l'abbé Delsue. (Bib. de l'Arsénal, MS. 7067.)

[25] *Pinolet ou l'aveugle parvenu*, Amsterdam, 1755.

[26] Amsterdam, 1756.

At first sight when one considers the extraordinary popularity of the novel of sentiment in the second half of the eighteenth century, it seems futile to hope for a survival of that realism the persistence of which we have been noting. Sentiment and realism appear mutually antagonistic if not mutually exclusive. Yet the contrary, I think, is the case.

At the end of the seventeenth century realism was an adjunct to satire. It was the instrument of satire in *Le Roman bourgeois* and in the *Roman comique*. We shall see that in the second half of the eighteenth century realism becomes the instrument of sentiment. The object of writers like Rousseau was to move their readers, to harrow them by recitals of passionate and unhappy love with all its complications. Their heroes are high-souled philanthropists oozing with the milk of human kindness. Bearing this in mind, what was more natural than to depict such heroes moving in drab surroundings and succoring decayed gentlewomen reduced to the direst poverty. The description of the sordid milieu was to provide yet another means of harrowing the sentimental soul. Realism becomes then the key which unlocks the floodgates of sentiment. Such is exactly the case in *Dorval*.[27] The hero is a sort of Grandisson who devotes his wealth to the relief of distress. One windy night he sees a poor creature shivering near the Palais Royal. He escorts her to her home in the rue Vivienne. Now for the realism. "Une chambre ou plutôt un galetas formait tout le logement. Un châlit couvert d'une méchante paillasse, d'un plus mauvais matelas et d'une très maigre couverture, quelques chaises en partie brisées, une table à demi rompue formaient le triste ameublement de ce séjour de douleur. . . ." The story continues in this tone.

The greatest exponent of sentimental realism in the novel of this time is Rétif de la Bretonne. His works, particularly *Monsieur Nicholas* (1796), teem with realist pictures of almost every category of low life. Realism with him is used not only to excite compassion but also to illustrate moral and social truths. The theme of the *Paysan perverti* (1776) for example is didactic: it is a warning to peasants not to leave the innocence of the hamlet for

[27] By Damiens de Gomiecourt, Amsterdam, 1769.

the vice of the city. The poor serving wench also comes into her own. His Tiennette though more realistic than Richardson's famous creation, yet has all Pamela's virtue and her annoying habit of kissing the hand that buffets her. The description of the downfall of Edmond the perverted peasant is vividly realist. The *maison publique* has no mysteries for Rétif who spares his reader nothing not even the revolting episode of the meeting between Edmond and his sister in one of these establishments. It is surely here that de Maupassant borrowed the idea for his *Le Port*.

As an indication of the growing change in the attitude of the critic towards realism let me quote the *Correspondance litteraire* for 1775 and 1785. The *Paysan perverti* "promène l'esprit sur les scènes de la vie les plus dégoûtantes et les plus viles et cependant il attache, il entraîne." Ten years later the same critic speaking of the *Paysanne pervertie*, says: "Ce sont des peintures les plus vives des séductions du vice et du libertinage mis en contraste avec les moeurs les plus simples et les plus pures, et les suites les plus effrayantes d'une vie déréglée." It will be observed that though the second novel is just as realistic as the first there is no longer any talk of its being vile or disgusting. The didactic value of the novel is the chief consideration so that any means are justifiable if the end be good.

Of Gorjy nothing is known save that he was nearly guillotined for a satire against Marat. He is, however, extremely important from our point of view. A sentimentalist and a realist his most suggestive novel is *Victorine* (1789). Victorine is entrusted to the care of a drunken washerwoman by a compassionate officer who rescues her from a burning house. This washerwoman, known as Marianne, is an interesting and faithful study of a drunken hag. To excite our sympathy for Victorine Gorjy plunges us into the dregs of realism. "Le soir Marianne se mit avec plusieurs de ses commères à boire jusqu'à ne pouvoir plus se soutenir tandis que mon souper fut a l'ordinaire du pain bis et dur, des fèves cuites dans un peu de graisse et quelques gorgées d'eau qu'il fallait boire a même d'un vieux pot de terre égueulé. . . Enfin, l'ivresse et le sommeil absorbèrent toutes leurs facultés. L'une s'étendit sur sa chaise et s'endormit en répandant sur elle un verre de vin qu'elle avait voulu, mais inutilement, porter à sa bouche. L'autre,

couchée sur la table ronflait à ne pas s'entendre. Celle-ci renversée sur le planche se vautrait dans le débris du repas. Celle-là toute débraillée s'était inondée elle-même du vin qu'elle avait bu. Marianne, échevelée, le visage dégouttant de sueur poussait des éclats de rire effrayants en voyant ses compagnes dans l'état où elles étaient. Elle voulut se lever; le jambes lui manquèrent. Elle tomba sur un banc, sa tête porta et aussitôt son visage fut couvert de sang."

F. C. GREEN.

University of Manitoba.

CHAUCER'S RENUNCIATION OF LOVE IN *TROILUS*

Perhaps no part of Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* has puzzled readers more than the renunciation of human love contained in the following familiar lines in the epilogue:

> O yonge fresshe folkes, he or she,
> In which that love up groweth with your age,
> Repeyreth hoom from worldly vanitee,
> And of your herte up-casteth the visage
> To thilke god that after his image
> Yow made, and thinketh al nis but a fayre
> This world, that passeth sone as floures fayre.
>
> And loveth him, the which that right for love
> Upon a cros, our soules for to beye,
> First starf, and roos, and sit in hevene a-bove;
> For he nil falsen no wight, dar I seye,
> That wol his herte al hoolly on him leye.
> And sin he best to love is, and most meke,
> What nedeth feyned loves for to seke?[1]

As every one knows, the suggestion for such an address to young folk came to Chaucer directly enough from the opening lines of the following parallel stanza in *Filostrato:*

> O giovanetti, ne' quai coll' etate
> Surgendo vien l'amoroso disio,
> Per Dio vi prego che voi raffreniate
> I pronti passi all' appetito rio,

---

[1] *Troilus and Criseyde,* v, 1835-1848.

E nell' amor di Troilo vi specchiate,
Il qual dimostra suso il verso mio,
Perchè se ben col cuor gli leggerete,
Non di leggieri a tutte crederete.[2]

That Chaucer received from Boccaccio no more than the merest suggestion, however, is obvious to one who reads the four succeeding stanzas in the Italian poem. Boccaccio is addressing young *men,* advising them to restrain their amorous desire, to remember that young women are fickle, vain, and unbalanced, to choose cautiously the "perfetta donna" who really desires love and who is circumspect and truthful, and to pray that they may escape loving and dying for evil women. From this doctrine Chaucer departs completely, and in at least two different ways. In the first place, to Boccaccio's aspersions upon young women in general[3] Chaucer opposes, a few lines earlier,[4] a passage addressed to women, in which he charges men with their full share of duplicity and infidelity. "Beth war of men!"[5]—this is Chaucer's retort to Boccaccio's disparagement of women. Chaucer's more fundamental alteration in Boccaccio's address, however, is the substitution of a moving Christian appeal to amorous young people, quoted above, for which the *Filostrato* offers not a hint.[6]

Since this appeal constitutes a virtual renunciation of the poem that precedes, no reader can escape here a feeling of bewilderment and a desire to discover some reasonable affiliation between the two. This desire Professor Tatlock has recently satisfied in very con-

[2] *Filostrato,* VIII, 29, 1-8.

[3] See *id.,* VIII, 30, 1-31, 8.

[4] *T. and C.,* V, 1779-1785.

[5] *T. and C.,* V, 1785.

[6] I assume that no one will venture to recognize such a hint in the passage (*Filostrato,* VIII, 33, 3-5),

ed orazione
Per lui fate ad amor pietosamente,
Ch' el posi in pace.

Miss Lisi Cipriani (*Publications of the Modern Language Association,* Vol. XXII [1907], pp. 582-583) infers that the Chaucerian stanzas show "most distinctly" the influence of the *Roman de la Rose* (ed. F. Michel, Vol. I, Paris, 1864, lines 4894-5349). But since the Christian parallels that Miss Cipriani cites specifically are confined to a passage (Michel, lines 5018-5121) which is "une grossière interpolation" (see *Le Roman de la Rose,* ed. E. Langlois, Vol. I, Paris, 1914, pp. 47-48), I assume that the alleged influence upon Chaucer may safely be disregarded.

siderable measure.[7] He suggests that the two stanzas before us "express the natural enough revulsion of a medieval mind to the strong emotion and painful outcome of the love story"; and further, that on behalf of his English readers and of himself Chaucer felt the need of a counterpoise to the unprecedented reality of the physical passion in the poem. "High and ennobling as the poem is, in no other medieval work is physical passion depicted with such naturalness and sympathy and made so attractive . . . . . With the wholly new intensity and reality of the poem, then, such an ending may well have been felt as satisfying and as more fitting than an unreligious close or a mere perfunctory muttered *Qui cum Patre.*"[8]

But although this interpretation is truly illuminating and convincing, it cannot be said to include all the possibilities. One may still harbor an impression that Chaucer's renunciation bears upon the poem also in a somewhat less general way. Since the love-story seems to be written in accordance with the principles of courtly love,[9] one may reasonably inquire, for example, whether the pious stanzas under consideration may apply in some definite fashion to this particular element in the composition as a whole.[10]

In the wording of the English lines, I confess, I can discern no precise reference to courtly love. One might be tempted to see in the word *feyned* ("feyned loves") a reference to the "fictitious"[11] aspect of the courtly system, and in "worldly vanitee,"

[7] J. S. P. Tatlock, *The Epilog of Chaucer's Troilus*, in *Modern Philology*, Vol. XVIII (1921), pp. 635-640.

[8] Tatlock, pp. 637, 638, 640.

[9] A somewhat inclusive bibliography in support of this interpretation is given by the present writer in *University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature*, No. 2 (1918), pp. 367-368. See also R. K. Root, *The Poetry of Chaucer*, Revised Edition, Boston, 1922, pp. 102-112.

[10] Professor Tatlock (p. 638, note 3) anticipates such a query, and conveys the general impression that courtly love contributed relatively little toward inciting Chaucer's disavowal.

[11] For this meaning of *feyned* see the *New English Dictionary* (feigned. 2). Concerning the fictitious aspect of courtly love see G. Zonta, in *Studi Medievali* (ed. F. Novati and R. Renier), Vol. III (1908-11), pp. 49-68; V. Crescini *Nuove Postille al Trattato Amoroso d'Andrea Cappellano*, in *Atti del Reale Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti*, Vol. 69, Part II (1909-10), pp. 1-99, 473-504,—especially pp. 36-37.

a direct warning against the same code. Thus young folk would be warned away from the kind of love embodied in the story of Troilus and Criseyde and recommended to the love of Christ. The opposition would then lie between *courtly* love and *heavenly* love. But however agreeable this specific interpretation might be to logic or architectonics, it must be admitted that the plain intent of Chaucer's stanzas is something more sweeping. The poet is renouncing not a particular code of love, but all the love in "this world, that passeth sone as floures fayre." As Troilus's departed spirit had observed, we "sholden *al* our herte on hevene caste." [12] The opposition really lies, then, between *earthly* love and *heavenly* love. The love of this world is "feyned" in the sense of "false" or "unstable"; only the love of Christ is true and permanent.

Although, then, the renunciation cannot be attached to the underlying amorous doctrine with detailed precision, there remains between the two at least a certain general attachment. In turning his back upon his love-story Chaucer inevitably condemned courtly love, along with undue physical passion, and along with any other unsanctified elements in the poem; hence there is no obstacle to one's surmising that Chaucer's revulsion of feeling arose as much from the false principles of courtly love in the poem as from the intensity and reality of the physical passion. Possibly, indeed, the influence arising from courtly love was the greater. Such seems to be the view of Professor Kittredge when he writes,[13] concerning the Chaucerian passage under consideration, "We come more and more to suspect that Troilus was right in his first opinion; [14] that the principles of the code [of courtly love] are somehow unsound . . . . He [Chaucer] has no solution except to repudiate the unmoral and unsocial system which he has pretended to uphold."

Those who share in this opinion, as I do, that the poet's revulsion of feeling arose more from the unsound morals of the poem than from its intense passion, may find a certain support, perhaps, from a piece of writing which, so far as I know, has not yet been

[12] *T. and C.*, v, 1825.

[13] G. L. Kittredge, *Chaucer and His Poetry*, Cambridge, 1915, p. 143.

[14] Troilus's first opinion is seen in his scoffing at love and lovers in Book I, lines 183-205. See Kittredge, p. 142.

brought to bear upon the Chaucerian disavowal. For it appears that the English poet was not the first who, after presenting the merits and practices of courtly love, suddenly renounced what he had done. Chaucer's procedure may perhaps seem less surprising when one recalls that Andreas Capellanus, the acknowledged codifier, expositor, and apologist of the courtly system,[15] uttered himself a similar renunciation. This utterance of Andreas occupies the third, and last, book of his *De Amore,* and is entitled *De reprobatione amoris.* Addressing the same Gualterius who is named in the preface to the whole work, Andreas solemnly declares that his fundamental purpose in expounding the art of love in the preceding two books has been to enable Gualterius, by avoiding love, to achieve the greater reward in heaven.[16] Having received full instruction in the nature and practice of courtliness, let the pupil renounce it altogether. The specific arguments whereby Andreas would dissuade his protégé from the amorous life are prolix and repetitious; hence I present them only in brief summary.

Having ordained marriage for mankind, God forbids extra-matrimonial *amours.*[17] It is irrational, therefore, to abandon one's eternal inheritance bought by Christ's blood, for a momentary pleasure of the flesh.

Quod ergo bonum ibi poterit inveniri, ubi nihil nisi contra Dei geritur voluntatem? Heu, quantus inest dolor, quantave nos cordis amaritudo detentat, quum dolentes assidue cernimus propter turpes et nefandos Veneris actus hominibus coelestia denegari! O miser et insanus ille ac plus quam bestia reputandus, qui pro momentanea carnis delectatione gaudia derelinquit aeterna et perpetuae gehennae flammis se mancipare laborat! . . . . Cuiuslibet igitur hominis satis est admiranda stultitia, qui pro vilissimis Veneris amplectendo terrenis hereditatem amittit aeternam, quam ipse Rex coelestis cunctis hominibus proprio sanguine recuperavit

[15] *Andreae Capellani . . . De Amore Libri Tres,* ed. E. Trojel, Copenhagen, 1892. As to Andreas's acknowledged position as an expositor of courtly love see, for example, Crescini, *op. cit.*, p. 1, 16-17; Fauriel, in *Histoire Littéraire de la France,* Vol. XXI (1847), pp. 320-326; G. Paris, in *Romania,* Vol. XII (1883), pp. 523-524; E. Langlois, *Origines et Sources du Roman de la Rose,* Paris, 1891, pp. 23-24; W. G. Dodd, *Courtly Love in Chaucer and Gower,* Boston, 1913, pp. 3-9.

[16] See Andreas, pp. 313-314.

[17] See Andreas, pp. 314-315, 331-332.

amissam.[18] Immo ad summam scimus verecundiam pertinere viventis et Dei omnipotentis iniuriam, si carnis illecebras et corporis voluptates secutus ad Tartareos iterum laqueos elabatur, ex quibus laqueis pater ipse coelestis semel eum unigeniti filii sui sanguinis effusione salvavit.[19]

Amours destroy friendships (id., pp. 316 f.), lead to poverty (p. 320), crimes (pp. 324-326), and wars (pp. 330 f.), incapacitate men for affairs (pp. 327 f.), weaken men's bodies (pp. 335-337), and impair their judgments (pp. 337 f.). Since illicit love has all these faults, and many others,[20] let Gualterius shun love's arts and watch for the coming of the heavenly bridegroom.

Cave igitur, Gualteri, amoris exercere mandata et continua vigilatione labora, ut, quum venerit sponsus, inveniat te vigilantem, nec de corporis iuventute confisum mundana delectatio te faciat in peccati dormitione iacere ac de sponsi tarditate securum, quia, eiusdem sponsi voce testante, nescimus diem neque horam.[21]

Clearly, then, Andreas utters a sweeping renunciation of the courtly love which he had previously expounded and illustrated, and which he had commended as *omnium fons et origo bonorum*.[22]

[18] Concerning the syntax of this sentence the editor remarks, "Error hic aliquis latet." But the general sense is apparent.

[19] Andreas, pp. 314-316. Cf. pp. 322-323.

[20] I am not undertaking to follow out the ramifications of Andreas's argument; and I omit his long and violent denunciation of women (pp. 338-357).

[21] Andreas, pp. 360-361.

[22] See Andreas, p. 81. The question as to whether Andreas was the more earnest in his *exposition* of courtly love (*De Amore*, Books I and II) or in his *renunciation* of it (*De Amore*, Book III) does not concern us fundamentally here. Whereas Zonta (pp. 57, 66) holds that the *renunciation* is the more sincere part, P. Rajna (*Tre Studi per la Storia del Libro di Andrea Cappellano*, in *Studj di Filologia Romanza*, Vol. v [1891], pp. 193-272,—especially p. 256) argues that the *exposition* rings truer. It has also been suggested (by Crescini, p. 36, for example, and by Rajna, p. 257) that in attaching a renunciation to his treatise Andreas was influenced by the relation of Ovid's *Remedia Amoris* to the *Ars Amatoria*. But one scarcely need remark that Ovid's *Remedia* is concerned with instructing a lover in means for extricating himself from a sensual entanglement, not with renouncing sensual love and commending religious piety.

In denouncing this conception of earthly love and in directing the thoughts of his pupil heavenward, the expositor provides something like a parallel to Chaucer's quasi-retraction. This parallelism I shall not press in detail. For likenesses in phraseology and in strands of thought I shall not argue; nor shall I undertake to show that Chaucer is under the direct influence of Andreas, here or elsewhere. In view of the wide distribution of the treatise *De Amore,* one is prepared to believe that Chaucer knew it, in Latin or in translation;[23] but I have in hand no proof of any such knowledge on his part. All that I venture to suggest is that what Andreas Capellanus did in his treatise upon courtly love helps to explain what Chaucer did in his courtly poem. We may now infer more confidently, perhaps, that in his disavowal the poet was incited in large measure by the amorous principles embodied in his story. If the expositor of the courtly system ends by directing our attention away from his code toward religious piety, Chaucer's turning from "love of kinde" toward "loves hete celestial" should, at the very least, seem more intelligible.

KARL YOUNG.

Yale University.

LAS CORTES DE LA MUERTE

In volume III of the *Obras de Lope de Vega* published by the Royal Spanish Academy, Menéndez y Pelayo inserted the *Auto de las Cortes de la Muerte* with its *loa.* He obtained the *auto* and *loa* from Justo de Sancha, editor of volume XXXV of the *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles,* and concerning them he says: "Sobre su autoridad va nuestro texto, que en el original que él vió, no sabemos si manuscrito ó impreso, llevaba los nombres de Lope de Vega y del Dr. Mira de Amescua, el primero al frente del auto, el segundo al frente de la *loa.* No respondemos de tales atribuciones, pero de todos modos no hemos querido omitir una composición antigua é ingeniosa, por más que en nada acreciente la

[23] Concerning the distribution and influence of this treatise see Fauriel, p. 321; Paris, in *Romania,* Vol. XII, pp. 526-527; Rajna, pp. 193-272.

gloria de los dos ilustres poetas á quienes se ha prohijado." [1] Professor Rennert in his *Life of Lope de Vega* includes the *auto* among the compositions by Lope,[2] and it is listed as doubtful in the *Vida de Lope de Vega* by Rennert and Castro.[3] Since the *auto* was practically unknown until it was published in 1893, earlier cataloguers do not mention it.

In 1898 Professor Restori called attention to the fact that *Las Cortes de la Muerte* was not an original work, and from the scenes which he was able to identify showed that much of the *auto* was made up of extracts taken practically verbatim from three of Lope's *autos,* and from a *loa* and *entremés* which, though not by Lope, were performed in conjunction with certain of Lope's religious plays. Restori says that *Las Cortes de la Muerte* "non è che un mosaico di parecchie scene di Lope, interpolate con due scene delle quali soltanto non son riuscito identificare la provenienza. Esse sono: una *definizione d'Amore* (III, 600, I, 1-53) che ha più del lirico che del drammatico, e colle *redondillas* del *Pecado* il lunghissimo *romance* del *Angel* (602, 1-604) il quale ha tutto il cattivo sapore delle imitazione calderoniane." [4] He then cites the sources of the material which he was able to find. The scenes which he was able to identify were taken from the *autos Las aventuras del hombre, El tirano castigado,* and *El Pastor lobo* by Lope de Vega, from the *loa* preceding the *Fiesta novena del Sacramento* and from the *Entremés de la muestra de los carros,* the latter by Benavente, the former probably not by Lope. He continues: "Le due scene aggiunte saranno esse l'opera del Mira? A me pare impossibile che due autore simili, anche colla nessuna importanza che davano a queste scritture, e magari spinti dalla fretta di sovvenire qualche compagnia comica a corto di novetà (il Montalban ha un gustoso aneddoto in proposito), mettessero insieme questa non *collaborazione* ma informe e disonesta *contaminazione.* Anche la loa è un frammento che non mi pare del Mira." [5] Restori discovered that the *Cortes de la Muerte* was not

[1] *Obras de Lope de Vega publicadas por la Real Academia Española,* Madrid, 1890-1914, III, XXV.

[2] *Life of Lope de Vega,* Glasgow, 1904, p. 547.

[3] *Vida de Lope de Vega,* Madrid, 1919, p. 528.

[4] *Degli "Autos" di Lope de Vega Carpio,* Parma, 1898, p. xvii, note 2.

[5] *Op. cit.,* p. xvii, note 2.

an original work. He felt reasonably certain that Lope and Mira did not have a hand in the composition of the *auto,* but his case, as far as he carried his investigations, is not as complete as one is led to believe by his statements. He claimed to have discovered practically all of the sources of the *auto,* while he has really overlooked much more than his remarks suggest. Moreover, he failed to call attention to the fact that all the borrowings which he discovered were from compositions printed in two volumes entitled *Fiestas del Santísimo Sacramento, repartidas en doce autos sacramentales, con sus loas y entremeses* [6] and *Navidad y Corpus Christi festejados por los mejores ingenios de España.*[7] In the former all the compositions were apparently supposed to be from Lope's pen. In order to prove conclusively that Lope was not responsible for *Las Cortes de la Muerte* it is obviously necessary to determine whether any of the passages in the *auto* have been taken from the works of authors other than Lope. The two scenes which Restori cited as coming from compositions not by Lope are not of major significance, because the *loa* and the *entremés* from which they were extracted form, as it were, an integral part of the *autos* with which they were performed.

As Restori has left matters it is possible to consider the *Auto de las Cortes de la Muerte* as a pot-pourri hastily put together by, or with the permission of, Lope and Mira to meet the urgent needs of a company of actors. The discovery of the following additional sources seems, however, definitely to clear up the matter. The *loa* which precedes the *auto* is not by Mira. It is taken entire, 92 verses, from the *Loa de la comedia de la perseguida Amaltea* by Francisco Tárrega, first published in *Doce comedias famosas de cuatro poetas naturales de . . . Valencia.*[8] The change in assonance after verse 44 is due to the fact that the borrower has passed over 94 verses of the original text. The scene in which *Pecado* figures, 69 verses (III, 602) [9] has been taken from the *Auto del Caballero del Febo* by Francisco de Rojas.[10] Again the irregu-

[6] Madrid, Zaragoza, 1644. Described by Barrera, *Catálogo,* p. 458.

[7] Madrid, 1664. Described by Barrera, *Catálogo,* pp. 709, 710.

[8] Valencia, 1608. *Cf.* Barrera, *Catálogo,* p. 677.

[9] Volume and page reference to *Obras de Lope de Vega publicadas por la Real Academia Española,* Madrid, 1890-1914.

[10] First published in *Navidad y Corpus Christi,* Madrid, 1664.

larity of versification is explained by the omission of 39 verses of the original. The song in *redondillas* (III, 607) which begins *Vela, vela, pecador* is taken from the *auto* entitled *Nuestra Señora del Rosario, la Madrina del Cielo* by Tirso de Molina.[11] One *redondilla* has been omitted. The long scene, 169 verses, in which the *Angel* figures (III, 602-604), occurs in the *auto La Gran Casa de Austria y divina Margarita* by Agustín Moreto.[12] The words are spoken in the last scene by Margarita. One of the *autos* by Lope which Restori overlooked is *El Niño Pastor.*[13] From it the compiler of the *Cortes* borrowed 43 verses: the lines in *romance* spoken by the *Niño* (III, 607) and the last words of the *Angel,* 9 verses in *romance.*

Of the remaining unidentified lines it has been impossible, in this country at least, to locate the originals of the scene in which *Cupido* figures, 48 verses in *redondillas,* and also the latter portion of the speech by *Locura,* 28 verses in *redondillas* preceded by 18 lines in *romance.* To these more important scenes can be added one *redondilla* [14] and one *quintilla.*[15] The unidentified lines total 103. Each of the foregoing longer scenes has certainly been borrowed from the works of other writers. The faultiness in composition is evidence of this fact. The *redondillas* spoken by *Cupido* are interrupted by a *quintilla,* and the *romance* verses in *e-a* in the scene in which *Locura* appears follow uninterruptedly upon *romance* lines in *o-o,* while they in turn are followed by *redondillas.* It is obviously true that the above-mentioned scenes have been copied from published works, and an examination of other *autos* and *loas* not available in the United States would doubtless reveal

[11] First published in *Navidad y Corpus Christi.*

[12] First published in *Navidad y Corpus Christi.*

[13] First published in *Fiestas del Santísimo Sacramento,* Madrid, 1644.

[14] Ahora conozco mi engaño
Y os suplico arrepentido
Me oigáis, Señor, condolido
De mi culpa y grave daño. (III, 607.)

[15] No quiere, no, el Redentor
La muerte del pecador,
Sí que muera arrepentido,
Pues perdonar al vencido
Es gloria del vencedor. (III, 607.)

the remaining sources. Even the scene in which *Cupido* figures will in all probability be found in some *loa* or *auto,* although Restori felt that it is more lyric than dramatic. As a matter of fact, the *loa* entitled *Del Amor* by Agustín de Rojas contains verses which are in exactly the same spirit.[16]

The published works which are known to have furnished the material for *Las Cortes de la Muerte* appeared at various dates, and extend over a period from 1608 to 1664. If one were sufficiently concerned over the date of composition of the *auto* it is obvious that a date later than 1664 must be assigned to it. Restori deduced in an interesting way, and came to the conclusion that the date of composition is some time in the first part of the eighteenth century.[17] But since the composition was unknown until about the middle of the last century, it seems quite as logical to consider it a work of the nineteenth century. However, the *auto* is a hoax, and should not merit our further consideration as a unified dramatic composition.

Obviously neither Lope nor Mira is guilty of the piece as it has been printed. Some one, for what purpose it is impossible to determine, exercised his ingenuity by taking extracts from four or more published works containing *autos* (three of these works have been cited) and formed an *auto* which he called *Las Cortes de la Muerte.*

Why the name of Mira de Amescua was added to that of Lope is a subject for conjecture only, for this author's works have apparently not been used. It does not seem possible, or even probable, that the unknown compiler possessed sufficient critical sense

[16] Amor es un accidente,
es un caos, es confusión,
es un no ver, no entenderse,
es en el siglo un infierno,
es rabia, es la misma muerte
y es la mayor maravilla
de las maravillas siete: *Colección de entremeses, loas, bailes. jácaras y mojigangas desde fines del siglo XVI a mediados del XVIII ordenada por* Don Emilio Cotarelo y Mori, Madrid, 1911, p. 370, no. 106.

[17] *Op. cit.*, p. xvii, note 2.

to realize that Mira resembled Lope more closely in his writings than any other of his contemporaries, and that his name would therefore serve well as that of a collaborator, for the compiler has made sudden changes in assonance, mingled *quintillas* with *redondillas,* and committed other atrocities with the verse, all of which confused and amazed Menéndez. The only other apparent justification for the use of Mira's name is the possibility that the *auto* mentioned earlier, *El Pastor lobo,* which was included in the *Fiestas del Santísimo Sacramento* is the same as a *suelto* (?) of the same name which is attributed to Mira de Amescua.[18] One might then assume that the compiler of *Las Cortes de la Muerte* was familiar with this work of Mira, and linked his name with that of Lope, perhaps to suggest that the *auto* was the result of collaboration.

An interesting study could be made of what constitutes the essential elements of an *auto.* That Justo de Sancha and Menéndez y Pelayo could be so misled as to believe that *Las Cortes de la Muerte* is an *auto sacramental* in the style of Lope or Mira or both appears to be a manifest indication of the fact that the *auto* before Calderón's time cannot be said to possess a definite form in so far as versification and scene length are concerned, or to possess a content which can be determined or delimited. But that is not the point of the present article.

It has been demonstrated that *Las Cortes de la Muerte* with its *loa* was constructed by an unknown compiler, who assembled extracts taken from *autos, loas,* and one *entremés,* composed by Tárrega, Rojas, Tirso de Molina, Moreto, Benavente, Lope de Vega, and others. It is not the work of Lope, and should be removed from the list of *autos* attributed to him.

George Irving Dale.

Washington University.

[18] *Cf.* Barrera, *op. cit.,* pp. 260, 458.

AN HOLY MEDYTACION—BY LYDGATE?

It has not been observed, so far as I am aware, that the poem *An Holy Medytacion,* printed by Dr. MacCracken in his collection of Lydgate's Minor Poems,[1] is for the most part almost a verbal translation of a Latin poem, *De Humana Miseria Tractatus,* edited by M. Esposito[2] from MS. E. 2. 33 in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin—the only MS. so far as is known, which preserves the text of this poem. The Dublin MS. was written in the fifteenth century, but this Latin poem, as M. Esposito believes, was composed by an Englishman during the reign of Henry III. This *Treatise on Human Wretchedness* is a satirical poem; "in rhythm and substance it is an imitation of the celebrated *Apocalypsis Goliae,*"[3] and it is immediately preceded in the Dublin MS. by the text of another *Golias* poem, namely the *De Conjuge non Ducenda.*[4] We may assume, then, without further argument that the Latin poem is much older than the fifteenth-century *Holy Medytacion.*

Inasmuch as both the Latin and English poems are easily accessible the reader who chooses to do so will have no difficulty in making detailed comparison of the two texts. As an illustration of the closeness with which the Middle English versifier followed his source, I cite the first four lines.

> Post tempus horridum   cessante pluuia
> Quo terra frigoris   gaudet absentia
> Vires recipiunt   queque nascentia
> Producunt arbores   flores et folia.

> Affter þe stormy tyme cesing þe rayn,
> Whane for þabsence of colde þeorþe is fayn,
> And þe qwyck thinges resceyue þeire vygour,
> And trees bringen foorþe leeff and flour.

The translator, to be sure, allows himself here and there to omit

[1] *The Minor Poems of John Lydgate,* Part I, EETS, Ext. Ser. CVII, 43-48.

[2] "A Thirteenth-Century Rhythmus," *English Historical Review,* XXXII (1917), 400-405.

[3] M. Esposito, *loc. cit.,* p. 401.

[4] Ed. T. Wright, *Poems of W. Mapes,* Camd. Soc., pp. 77-85. For references to the numerous MSS. of this poem see M. Esposito's note.

or to expand the phrases of his original. Lines 42, 43, for example, which represent the denunciation of the flesh which follows as inspired by God, have no counterpart in the Latin. Again, lines 63-66 and 69-72 are expansions introduced in the English text. In general, however, the first 73 lines of the English poem are a fairly close rendering of the first 60 lines of the Latin original.

At this point the first significant variation appears. The English poet, who was writing with a didactive rather than a satiric purpose, inserts a passage of some length (vv. 74-110) descriptive of the joys of heaven and the torments of hell. At v. 111 the translator turns back to his source, and from this point to v. 166 he gives us a somewhat freer paraphrase of vv. 61-91 in the Latin text. The only changes of moment are the insertion of didactic amplifications, such as vv. 115-118, 134-146, and 154-156.

But with v. 166 all parallels to the Latin text suddenly cease. The translator concludes his poem by a conventional homiletic appeal to his reader to repent, confess, and make satisfaction for his sins, and thus come to the bliss of heaven. The Latin poem proceeds in quite another vein to indulge in satire on the power of money, especially in the court of Rome:

> Roma que capud est   orbis, ut dicitur
> Mater cupidinis   palam efficitur.

A comparison of the two poems, therefore, affords an interesting example of the process by which a thirteenth-century satire was transformed in the fifteenth century into *An Holy Medytacion.*

Now that we recognize the source of the English poem, we may proceed to re-examine the evidence on which it has been assigned to Lydgate. The first 20 lines, with their picture of the renewal of Nature in the Springtide, may possibly have been regarded as a reminiscence of the opening lines of the Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales,* and therefore may have lent color to the view that they were written by Chaucer's disciple, the Monk of Bury. At least I will acknowledge that in my own mind this fancied resemblance had its influence in considering the question of Lydgate's authorship. But with the Latin source before us, it is clear that the author of the English verses was not echoing Chaucer. Indeed, as the case now stands, the Springtide picture, so

far as it has any bearing on the question of authorship, counts against Lydgate instead of in his favor. For it is reasonable to suppose that if Lydgate had been translating this Latin poem he would have been reminded so forcibly of Chaucer's Prologue that in rendering

> Per prata redolet mira suauitas
> Virgulta uolucrum replet garulitas

he would not have been able to keep out some of Chaucer's phrases.

Moreover, the *Holy Medytacion* is composed in couplets, instead of in the stanza forms which Lydgate employed almost exclusively for his shorter poems. Indeed, in the collection of his Minor Poems published by Dr. MacCracken, this is the solitary instance of a poem written in couplets. In view of this departure from Lydgate's established usage, strong evidence would seem to be required to establish his claim to this poem.

When we examine the evidence from the manuscripts we find but slender support for the tradition of Lydgatean authorship. The *Holy Medytacion* is preserved in only two MSS.—both of them written by John Shirley. In Trinity College MS. R. 3. 20 (No. 600 in Dr. James's Catalogue) the poem stands between Chaucer's *Compleynte of Anelida* and Occleve's *Letter of Cupid,* without any indication of its authorship. But in MS. Ashmole 59 it appears with the following heading: "Here nowe folowe þe an holy meditacon made by þe Religious man Lidegate Daun Johan, þe munk of Bury." This ascription is the sole testimony in favor of Lydgate's authorship; how much confidence can we place in it? "This Ashmole manuscript," declares Miss Hammond,[5] "though written by Shirley's own hand, is inferior to the Trinity College and British Museum volumes transcribed by him. Many of its copies, as already pointed out (*Mod. Lang. Notes,* Feb., 1904, p. 36), are hasty, garbled, and scramblingly written; and this carelessness of execution furnishes one reason, as I have above mentioned, for selecting the Trinity College text of a poem in preference to the Ashmole text." The explanation for this Miss Hammond finds in the fact that Shirley transcribed the Ashmole MS. after the year 1447, when he was upwards of eighty years of age.

[5] *Anglia,* XXVII, 397.

Moreover, in Ashmole 59 we find expressly ascribed to Lydgate two other poems which are universally rejected from the Lydgate canon: (1) A macaronic prayer to the Blessed Virgin (fol. 21^b) and (2) "Quia amore langueo" (fol. 66^a).

Finally, it may be observed, if we turn to the text of the poem itself, we find several instances of "penultimate or antepenultimate rhyme of words in -oun"—one of the tests employed by Dr. MacCracken [6] in distinguishing spurious from genuine Lydgatean verse. Thus, *mutácyoún: consolácyóun* (19, 20), *afféccíón: corréccíón* (41, 42), and *afféccyóun: dyléccyóun* (143, 144).

Neither external nor internal evidence, therefore, appears to give valid ground for assigning the *Holy Medytacion* to the Monk of Bury. But I can not feel that in removing this poem from his canon we are seriously impairing the lustre of Lydgate's poetic laurels.

CARLETON BROWN.

Bryn Mawr College.

BITTER BEER-DRINKING.

In the Old English *Andreas*, after the hero has been imprisoned the fourth time by the pagans, he addresses an ancient pillar, commanding it to send forth a flood against his tormentors; whereupon (Root's translation, ll. 1528-35),

> Water deeply stirred
> Seized on the earth; the host was sore dismayed
> At terror of the flood; the youths were doomed,
> And perished in the deep; the rush of war
> Snatched them away with terror of the sea.
> *That was a grievous trouble, bitter beer;*
> *The ready cupbearers did not delay—*
> *From daybreak on, each man had drink to spare.*

The word here translated "beer" is, in the original, rather a "receiving or taking of beer," and hence, as Kennedy renders it, a beer-feast (*bēorþegu;* cf. the *wīnþegu* of *Dan.* 17; *Gifts of Men* 74).

[6] *Minor Poems of Lydgate*, p. vii; cf. also *Anglia*, XXXIII, 284.

Clearly it was an experience—the experience of drowning—that the poet sought to characterize as bitter. It was a psychical reaction, not a physical sensation, that was uppermost in his mind. If, in the employment of his figure, he was thinking of bitter beer as unpleasant, it might be argued that the normal beer of that period, presumably agreeable, was not bitter. Such a conclusion would seem to be in harmony with the view of the best authorities that hops were hardly known in England before the sixteenth century, when they probably came in from the Low Countries (see the *New Eng. Dict.* under *ale, beer,* and *hop*). It is true that Hoops maintains (*Reallexikon* 1. 280) that bitter herbs were employed from the earliest times in the Teutonic territories to impart their flavor to beer; but he makes no specific statement of this sort with reference to England. Moreover, the first mention of the growing of hops in Northern Europe belongs to the year 768 (Hoops, *op. cit.*, p. 282), and concerns France alone; this can hardly have affected England in any way, certainly not by the time that *Andreas* was written.

In translations from the Bible, *bēor* is several times employed to render Latin *sicera,*[1] itself from Greek *σίκερα,* adapted from *shēkār,* the Hebrew word for "strong drink." Thus the words *wīn* and *bēor* are used to translate *vinum* and *sicera* in Deut. 14. 26; 29. 6; Lk. 1. 15.[2] In the Vulgate, *shēkār* and *σίκερα* are not always rendered, however, by Latin *sicera;* thus in Isa. 24. 9 these words are translated by *potio.* I conceive this verse, Isa. 24. 9, to have been in the mind of the author of *Andreas* (Bishop Acca?) when he wrote line 1533. The Latin and the Greek are:[3]

[1] From this word comes English *cider,* modified from earlier *sicer* (still found in 1582 in the Douay version of Lk. 1. 15).

[2] *Ealu* is added to *bēor* in Ælfric, *Hom.* 2. 38, and substituted for it in Judg. 13. 4; *Bl. Hom.*, p. 165.

[3] The A. V. translates: "They shall not drink wine with a song; *strong drink shall be bitter to them that drink it.*"

With this verse compare Ecclus. 31. 39 (29): "Amaritudo animæ vinum multum potatum"; or, in English: "Wine drunken with excess maketh bitterness of the mind." A more critical rendering is that by Charles, in his edition of the Apocrypha: "Headache, derision, and dishonor is wine drunk in strife and vexation."

The preceding verse is (Isa. 24. 8): "Cessavit gaudium tympanorum, quievit sonitus lætantium, conticuit dulcedo citharæ" (cf. Isa. 5. 12),

Cum cantico non bibent vinum; *amara erit potio bibentibus illam.*

. . . ; *πικρὸν ἐγένετο τὸ σίκερα τοῖς πίνουσιν.*

A similar idea to that of the line in *Andreas* occurs in *Gu.* 540-2:[4]

> þæt hē bibūgan mæge þone bitran drync
> þone Eve fyrn Adame geaf,
> byrelade brȳd geong.

In the Old High German *Ludwigslied* (53-4) of 881 there is an

---

the A. V. having: "The mirth of tabrets ceaseth, the noise of them that rejoice endeth, the joy of the harp ceaseth." With the last clause may be compared the *hearpan wyn* of *Beow.* 2262, which is immediately followed by the equivalent kenning, *gomen glēobēames*. On this coinage may then be based the *hearpan wynne, gomenwudu grētte* of *Beow.* 2107-8, and the *gomenwudu* of *Beow.* 1065. All these characterizations of the harp and its sweetness may, then, come ultimately from Isaiah (curiously enough, *hearpan wyn* represents the Hebrew, rather than the Latin), and are in turn appropriated by Cynewulf (*Chr.* 670, *glēobēam* grētan) and the author of *Gifts of Men* (50 *glēobēames*). (It may be observed that, from the beginning of this chapter, Isaiah is describing the signs of a day of judgment, and that it is a mournful condition which is depicted in *Beow.* 2249b-2266).

[4] Kennedy translates (*The Poems of Cynewulf*, p. 289): "(Nor was there any man in that noble race ever again so eager in the will of God, so wise of heart) that he might shun *that bitter drink* which of old Eve gave unto Adam, which the young bride poured out." With this compare the much longer passage, *Gu.* 953-964 (Kennedy, *op. cit.*, pp. 292-3: "The drink was now at hand that Eve brewed for Adam in the beginning of the world. The fiend first served it to the woman, and she then poured out that *bitter potion* [lit. cup] to Adam, her well-loved man, whose children have grimly made requital [rather, paid tribute] for that olden deed; so that from the beginning there has not been a man on earth, nor one of human race, who might shield himself, or shun the *livid draught* of Death's deep cup."

Over against the bitter cup of death we may place the cup of heavenly life, or of heavenly knowledge, with which St. Cuthbert and his friend Herebert refreshed each other: Bede, *Eccl. Hist.* 4. 29: "Qui dum sese alterutrum cælestis vitæ poculis debriarent," where the Old English has (ed. Miller, p. 370): "Ðā hīe ðā . . . him betwih bǣdewēg scencton þæs heofenlican līfes." Here Bede's life of Cuthbert reads (chap. 28), "cælestis *sapientiæ* poculis." Cf. Ps. 116. 13, "the cup of salvation" (*calicem salutaris*).

apparent imitation of the passage in *Andreas* (Braune, *Althochdeutsches Lesebuch,* 7th ed., p. 151):

> Her skancta cehanton sīnan fīanton
> Bitteres līdes.[5]

ALBERT STANBURROUGH COOK.

Yale University.

AN OVIDIAN PROTOTYPE OF A CHARACTER IN *WILHELM MEISTER*

Some fifteen years ago, under the stimulus of a conviction that Goethe scholars had devoted a too exclusive attention to *Faust* and that the other great work, which had occupied the poet almost as long, had fallen into an undeserved neglect, there were published two important books dealing with the genesis of *Wilhelm Meister:* Eugen Wolff, *Mignon,* 1909, and Hans Berendt, *Goethes Wilhelm Meister,* 1911. The discovery of the *Theatralische Sendung* in 1910 might have been expected to add a fresh impetus to this reawakening of interest in Goethe's novel.

Wolff, who laid stress especially upon literary influences, produced evidence which seemed to show a considerable indebtedness of Goethe to Lucian's *Dialogues* for the *milieu* and characters of the theatrical world described in the novel. A colloquy between mother and daughter, in which the girl is admonished to bestow her favors upon a rich lover instead of upon his impecunious rival, is believed by Wolff to have suggested the situation of Mariane between Norberg and Wilhelm, with the part of the worldly wise mother taken by Barbara, the old "Sibyl" who acts as Mariane's servant and confidante. This hypothesis is weakened by the consideration that Wieland's translation of Lucian, which would have made him easily accessible to Goethe, did not appear until 1788, ten years after the completion of the First Book of the

[5] In the Old Saxon *Heliand, līth* is found eight times (126, 2013, 2016, 2025, 2050, 2055, 2063, 5651), in the rendering of Lk. 1. 15; Jn. 2. 3 ff.; Mt. 27. 48 (Mk. 15. 36). Gothic *leithus* translates *sicera* in Lk. 1. 15. Besides being occasionally used in prose, Old English *līð* occurs in *līðwǣge*, can or cup of strong drink, *Beow.* 1982 (cf. *ealowǣge*, *Beow.* 481, 496, 2021).

Theatralische Sendung, which already contained the Wilhelm-Mariane-Barbara situation in all its essential features.

This very situation is to be found, however, in another classical writer, who may fairly be called a favorite author of Goethe's, namely, in Ovid. The *Metamorphoses* is among the books mentioned in *Dichtung und Wahrheit* as having occupied an important place in Goethe's early reading. The student took it with him to Strassburg, where he was much perturbed by Herder's attack upon his favorite, and both the *Wanderjahre* and the Second Part of *Faust* bear witness to his continued interest. The motto under the caption *Zweiter Römischer Aufenthalt* of the *Italienische Reise* is a quotation from the *Fasti,* and the elegiac mood which accompanied his departure from Rome recalled to Goethe's mind a passage from the *Tristia.* The epigram *Ferne,* addressed to Frau von Stein and written in 1782, was inspired by the *Heroides,* and the classic beauty of the *Römische Elegien* owes much to a conscientious study, together with other models, of Ovid, the greatest master of the elegiac measure in Latin literature.

In the *Amores* of Ovid, the eighth elegy of the First Book deals with the *lena,* or bawd, a type borrowed from Comedy, where it had originally been developed. This poem is by a German editor [1] appropriately superscribed *Kuppelcatechismus.* The poet, concealed in the apartment of his mistress, is a scandalized witness of the bawd's nefarious attempt to profane their modest *liaison.* I quote from Professor Showerman's translation,[2] with some abridgements and paraphrases to save space.

The bawd to the lady: "Know you, my light, that yesterday you won the favor of a wealthy youth? Caught fast, he could not take his eyes from your face. And why should you not win favor? Second to none is your beauty. Ah me, apparel worthy of your person is your lack! I could wish you as fortunate as you are most fair—for with you become rich, I shall not be poor. A rich lover has desired you; he has interest in your needs. . . .

"It may be that the ladies of olden time confined their favors to one man, but now 'tis Venus rules in the city of her Aeneas.

[1] *P. Ovidi Nasonis Amorum libri tres, erklärt von Paul Brandt,* Leipzig, 1911, 1. Abt., p. 60.

[2] *Ovid, Heroides and Amores, with an English translation by Grant Showerman,* London and New York, 1914, p. 349 ff.

Nowadays beautiful ladies divert themselves; chaste is she whom no one has asked—, or, be she not too countrified, she herself asks first. . . .

"Think, what does your fine poet give you besides fresh verses? You will get many thousands of lover's lines to read. Let him who will give be greater for you than great Homer; believe me, there is genius in giving too. Do not look down upon the rich lover because he is of humble birth, nor let yourself be deluded by the good family of the other. Take thy grandfathers and go, thou lover who art poor! Nor is there harm in pretended love; allow your gallant to think he is loved, and take care lest this love bring you nothing in. Let your tongue aid you, and cover up your thoughts—wheedle while you despoil."

The poem ends with a vigorous imprecation pronounced by the poet on the head of the old beldam, with her sparse white hair, her eyes lachrymose from wine, and her wrinkled cheeks. "May the gods give you no abode and helpless age, and long winters and everlasting thirst."

The parallel will seem sufficiently close to one who recalls the First Book of the *Lehrjahre.* Barbara, like Ovid's *lena,* prefers the rich lover to the poor, and uses all her influence with Mariane in Norberg's behalf. She, likewise, views the situation with an eye single to material advantage for herself and her mistress, and is not at a loss for pragmatic arguments to fortify her counsels. Norberg is shrewd enough not to forget her in his gifts, and Barbara has the same contempt for the penniless *dilettante* Wilhelm as the classic bawd for the poet-lover. The resemblance extends to the bibulousness which is a vice common to both hags.

On the other hand, Barbara is unmistakably a character with an individuality of her own, vividly sketched, plastically modelled, a classical counterpart to Frau Marthe in *Faust,* who betrays a kinship with the familiar figure of "die alt Kupplerin" in Hans Sachs. The art which created Barbara has been praised by many critics, from Friedrich Schlegel down.

And if the situation is similar, how different is the treatment! It is unnecessary to emphasize the futility of applying a moral yardstick to Ovid. The *Amores* are not love poems at all, in our sense. They are a poetical exercise, a study ἐν τοῖς ἐρωτικοῖς in the Alexandrian tradition, without genuine feeling or real passion. They are charming, witty, cynical, ironic, with the Latin *malice*

which found its most characteristic expression among writers of our time in Anatole France. Yet for all its classic perfections of form, the frigid obscenities of Ovid's poem are repugnant to modern taste. How differently are we affected by the moving history of Mariane and Wilhelm, Goethe's "geliebtes dramatisches Ebenbild!"[8] One may compare for example the corresponding scenes in which the lovers are disillusioned. Ovid, with ingenious irony, makes himself the hidden observer of the bawd's artifices practised upon his all too willing mistress, so that he is compelled to hear his rival praised and himself contemned, yet is prevented by circumstances from giving vent to his righteous indignation. This is a tragicomic situation, and the poet makes the most of its comic possibilities. Now Goethe too ironizes his hero (as with Ovid a poetical image of himself), particularly in the later conception of the *Lehrjahre,* but in a spirit exactly opposite to Ovid's. What tragic irony in Wilhelm's transports of happy love, to be followed abruptly by the catastrophe of the discovery! Ovid's irony is cruel and cold, Goethe's is blended with a tender pity for the guileless youth whose pure passion is so grossly and brutally betrayed. The fervor of diction and the prose rhythms of *Werther* are echoed in the closing scene of this tragedy of love:

"Und ihre Gestalt. . . . Er verlor sich im Andenken an sie, seine Ruhe ging in Verlangen über, er umfasste einen Baum, kühlte seine heisse Wange an der Rinde, und die Winde der Nacht saugten begierig den Hauch auf, der aus dem reinen Busen bewegt hervordrang. Er fühlte nach dem Halstuch, das er von ihr mitgenommen hatte, es war vergessen, es steckte im vorigen Kleide. Seine Lippen lechzten, seine Glieder zitterten vor Verlangen.

"Die Musik hörte auf, und es war ihm, als wär' er aus dem Elemente gefallen, in dem seine Empfindungen bisher emporgetragen wurden. Seine Unruhe vermehrte sich, da seine Gefühle nicht mehr von den sanften Tönen genährt und gelindert wurden.

[8] Calling attention to this fundamental difference of conception does not imply a desire to hold Ovid up to public execration as a monster of vice nor to exalt Goethe as a paragon of virtue in such matters. Certainly there are few poets in whose case such an invidious comparison would be more absurd. It is a curious fact that Goethe's suppressed poem, *Das Tagebuch* (cf. Werke, Weimar Ed., 2. Abt. v, 345 ff.) deals frankly with the same subject as *Amores* III, vii, the only one of Ovid's poems which Professor Showerman felt constrained to omit from his translation.

Er setzte sich auf ihre Schwelle nieder und war schon mehr beruhigt. Er küsste den messingenen Ring, womit man an ihre Türe pochte, er küsste die Schwelle, über die ihre Füsse aus und ein gingen, und erwärmte sie durch das Feuer seiner Brust. Dann sass er wieder eine Weile stille und dachte sie hinter ihren Vorhängen, im weissen Nachtkleide, mit dem roten Band um den Kopf, in süsser Ruhe, und dachte sich selbst so nahe zu ihr hin, dass ihm vorkam, sie müsste nun von ihm träumen. Seine Gedanken waren lieblich, wie die Geister der Dämmerung; Ruhe und Verlangen wechselten in ihm, die Liebe lief mit schaudernder Hand über alle Saiten seiner Seele; es war, als wenn der Gesang der Sphären über ihm stille stünde, um die leisen Melodien seines Herzens zu belauschen."

Nothing, surely, could be less Ovidian than that.

F. STANTON CAWLEY.

Harvard University.

REVIEWS

Il Filostrato by GIOVANNI BOCCACCIO, translated into English verse by HUBERTIS CUMMINGS. The Princeton Press, Princeton, N. J., 1924.

Twice before has Boccaccio's *Filostrato* been translated into a foreign language, once into French prose in the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century by Pierre de Beauvais, Seneschal of Anjou, in his *Troilus,* published by Moland and D'Héricault, in *Nouvelles françoises en prose du XIV Siècle* in *Bibliothèque Elzévirienne,* Paris, 1858, and once into German verse in the nineteenth century by Karl Freiherr von Beaulieu Marconnay in his *Troilus und Kressida,* Berlin, A. Hofmann, 1884. This third translation of the poem by Professor Cummings is, save for the paraphrase of a considerable portion by Chaucer, the first in English.

The translator has preferred a metrical form for a metrical original, although, unlike Beaulieu, who retained the *ottava rima* of the Italian, he has chosen, as more suitable to his English, to substitute an alexandrine in place of a pentameter in the final verse of each stanza, following therein the practice of Spenser.

By presenting the *Filostrato* in metrical dress Professor Cum-

mings has performed the useful service of helping to reveal the author, who is at present known mainly by the prose *Decameron,* in his no less noteworthy character as poet. For to Boccaccio belongs the credit of having in the *Filostrato*—and later in the *Teseide*—been the first to turn to literary account the popular verse measure of his day known as the *ottava rima,* which afterwards became in the hands of Ariosto and Tasso the standard meter of Italian epic. Furthermore, the variety of other verse forms which he has used in the *Ameto,* the *Amorosa Visione,* and the *Canzoni* abundantly attests his right to the title of poet.

To the task of providing a metrical rendering of the *Filostrato* Cummings has brought not only a scholarly knowledge of his author, amply reviewed in his doctoral dissertation, *The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to the Italian Works of Baccaccio* (*University of Cincinnati Studies,* 1916), but also a native delicacy and refinement of feeling far more essential than scholarly apparatus to the difficult task of translating from the poetry of one language into that of another. In particular, aesthetic sensibilities of a high order were needed to couch in an idiom as rugged and essentially masculine as English that exquisitely faint and fugitive aroma, so largely dependent upon a feminine fineness of phraseology distinctively Italian, which distinguishes this poem above the other works of its author. In the accomplishment of this signal achievement the translator has drawn to his aid the eminently appropriate archaisms of French derivation used by Chaucer, such as *joyaunce, pleasaunce, gentilesse, noblesse,* etc. By virtue of this happy expedient as well as by the fidelity with which he has adhered to the complicated rhyme scheme of the Italian, Cummings has succeeded to a high degree in reproducing the spirit of his original. While allowing himself the freedom indispensable to metrical translation, he has not, as Pope in the *Iliad,* made of the *Filostrato* in any sense a new poem after his own tastes. If, as Mathew Arnold says, the first duty of the translator be to produce upon the mind of his reader the same impression that the author he is translating produced upon the mind of the reader (or auditor) of his own day, we can, in so far as it is possible to judge from our own standpoint, make no doubt of the success of the translation. To the general impression of facile

and graceful artistry conveyed by the volume as a whole the handsome type and page provided by the Princeton Press contribute conspicuously. This harmony between the content and the format of the volume should recommend it strongly to the lover and collector of books.

It must be confessed, however, that to the scholar Cummings' translation will prove less valuable than to the amateur. There is, in the first place, room to doubt whether, as Cummings hopes in his preface, the translation can be of any great assistance to the Chaucerian scholar anxious to make an exact comparison of the language of the English with that of the Italian poet. No doubt the student of Chaucer will at times wish to know the general content of the *Filostrato* that he may discover what portions Chaucer has utilized and what changes, if any, of a broad and outstanding character he has made in these portions. This he can readily do from reading Cummings' translation. But if his object be the finer one of delicate phraseological comparison, his attempts will be to a large extent baffled. Undoubtedly such a close literal rendering as would provide opportunity for this minute phraseological comparison is largely, if not wholly, precluded by the choice on the part of the translator of a metrical rendering. One cannot well in such a case kill two birds with one stone. Certainly for the general reader, anxious merely to obtain a faithful reproduction of the spirit of the poem in a smooth and artistic translation, a literary rendering would have proved less welcome than the far more difficult and ambitious achievement that Professor Cummings has so well executed. But while the translator should not be held to task for not having provided what was excluded by his design, it must be acknowledged that he is not always careful to reproduce accurately the exact meaning of his original. This defect will frequently cause embarrassment not only to the Chaucerian student, but also to the student of Italian literature. In a number of cases he either misses or, in his search for a striking and harmonious English equivalent, misrepresents the sense now of single words and now of whole clauses in the Italian. To limit the unwelcome and seemingly invidious task of citing examples to a single instance of each kind, we may notice Cummings' rendering of the Italian *accorta* (canto I, stanza 11, verse 7) as

"dainty and lissom." Certainly the word *accorto,* which is, by the way, a favorite adjective of the author in personal descriptions, occuring again I, 19, 8, II, 28, 1, and 71, 7, IV, 19, 6 and 50, 5, is not covered or touched in meaning by either or both of the English adjectives used by Cummings, and means a mental, not a physical attribute, here perhaps "discerning." An example of an erroneous rendering of an entire clause is furnished by the translation of canto I, stanza 28, verses 1-3. Here the Italian, according to the edition of Moutier, Florence, 1831, which is presumably that used by the translator, runs as follows:

> Piacque quell atto a Troilo, al tornare
> Ch' ella fe' in sè, alquanto sdegnosetto,
> Quasi dicesse: non ci si può stare?

Cummings here translates as follows:

> Which graceful gesture pleased young Troilo,
> So in the movement showed her dainty pride,—
> As if she said: "May not a wight stand so?"—

The error here lies both in the meaning and in the construction of the clause beginning "al tornare" and ending "fe' in sè." *Tornare in sè* means "to recover one's composure," the reference being backward to the words *donnesca altezza* of the preceding stanza, and the idea expressed in the construction *al* followed by the infinitive is that of temporal sequence, which in English would have to be rendered by a clause consisting of "upon" followed by the verbal noun or "once" followed by the past tense. Accordingly the whole clause would have to be translated, "Upon recovering" or "once she had recovered her composure," etc. This passage is of peculiar interest from the standpoint, above indicated, of comparison with Chaucer, since it is one that the English poet undertook to reproduce, but either failed to understand or did not care to take the trouble to render accurately, and thus missed one of the finest psychological touches in the Italian.

It is, moreover, to be regretted, both from the standpoint of the scholar and from that of the general reader, that Professor Cummings should not have seen fit to include the *Proemio* in his translation. In this document, which is in prose and which is addressed by the author to his lady, Maria d'Aquino, Boccaccio re-

veals the occasion that prompted the composition of the poem that follows. He here explains to his *nobillissima donna* that he was led to the composition of the *Filostrato* by the fact that she had recently left Naples for Sannio, and that, being plunged thereby into the deepest distress, he had determined to give vent to his sorrow in song and to have recourse for that purpose to the ancient story of the love-lorn Troilus as furnishing an apt parallel to his own case. But, as he is careful to add, the excellent lady Maria must guard against the error of applying to herself all the implications of the antique fable. For not only must not the poet dare to hope that such bliss will ever be his as came to Troilus in the full possession of Cressida, but more particularly he warns his lady against the folly of supposing that he could have the temerity to imply that she would ever become as faithless to him as Cressida became to Troilus. These declarations of the author in the *Proemio* are of the utmost value in enabling us to determine the stage reached by the poet in his courtship of Maria at the time that the *Filostrato* was written, as well as the chrononogical position occupied by the poem among the other juvenile romances of Boccaccio, in which, as is well known, he alludes in one fashion or another to his love for this lady. Thus it is evident from the tone of despair in which he remonstrates with his innamorata because of her departure from Naples that he had already made considerable headway in his courtship. From this it may be inferred that the poem was written after the earlier portion of the *Filocolo,* in which he describes his first sight of Maria in the temple and his subsequent talk with her in the convent, in the course of which he received from her a commission to write that earliest of his romances. It is likewise clear from the two caveats added by the author to warn his lady against taking to herself the further implications of the Trojan story that the poem was written both before he had, by means of a nocturnal surprise, stolen from her the final favors and before he had been deserted by her for another lover. From this it may be inferred that the poem was written before the *Ameto* and before the later portion of the *Filocolo,* in both of which express reference is made to these subsequent events. In other words, we may say that the *Filostrato*

was written after Boccaccio had become well acquainted with Maria, but before he had gained full possession of her person, and while he was, despite the purely conventional demurrer of the *Proemio,* living in high hopes of the eventual gratification of his desires. This evidently critical phase in the relation of the poet to Maria at the time has, furthermore, an important bearing upon the character of the poem itself. In no other of his works has Boccaccio reached the high level of fervent eloquence that appears in the *Filostrato.* He uses a language of exalted passion, fraught with echoes of the *Vita Nuova* of Dante and other specimens of the *dolce stil nuovo,* both in addressing his lady in the *Proemio* and also, not infrequently, in his representation of the grief of Troilus at the departure of Cressida. We have accordingly, alike from this elevated language and from the explicit statements of the *Proemio,* every reason to believe that the *Filostrato* was written when its author was on the rising tide of a passion that was sweeping him ever nearer to the object of his heart's desire. For these several reasons it cannot be too strongly emphasized that the *Proemio* should always be read in connection with the *Filostrato,* to which it furnishes the key and of which it was intended by the author to serve as an inseparable part. Furthermore, the inclusion of the *Proemio,* in which constant reference is made to the absence of Maria from Naples, would have saved the translator from making in his note (p. 189) the mistake of supposing that the *Filostrato* may have been written in Florence.

NATHANIEL E. GRIFFIN.

University of Pennsylvania.

Studien zum Bedeutungswandel im Deutschen, II, von E. WELLANDER. Uppsala Universidets Årsskrift, 1923. vii + 187 pp.

Einführung in die Bedeutungslehre, von H. SPERBER. Bonn und Leipzig, 1923. iv + 96 pp.

In the extremely difficult subject of defining and circumscribing semantic phenomena probably no one has done more in recent years than Wellander. His *Studien zum Bedeutungswandel,* I,

appearing in 1917, was generally acknowledged as holding a place next in importance to the works of Paul[1] and Wundt.[2] Following in the main Paul's logical rather than Wundt's psychological conception of development of meaning he yet was able to clarify obscurities in both and to suggest new points of view for the treatment and classification of semantic material. The above work is a continuation of this study of almost equal length but scarcely of equal importance. This is not because the author has not acquitted himself equally well of his task, but rather because the subject-matter has yielded fewer positive results from the standpoint of semantics.

Wellander takes up the study of the syntactical ellipsis in the German language with the object of determining its semantic significance. In this he sets himself the task of collecting, defining and classifying the numerous cases of omission (of word, phrase, or clause), and of determining, in as far as possible, the sources of and the reasons for the omissions. In opposition to the view usually taken by writers on syntax, Wellander does not consider every case of omission as representing some type of ellipsis. In his first chapter he discusses the various types of non-elliptical omissions. In this the most important in its bearing on the study of semantics is what he terms "semantically determined word-reduction" (*semasiologisch bedingte Wortreduktion*). This is what Paul (*Prinzipien*, § 62) and others have generally called *specialization of meaning*. For example: *Schirm* 'protection' to *Schirm* 'umbrella' is usually explained simply as a case of specialization of meaning. For Wellander, however, it is not merely a question of semantics but first a morphological problem of the suppression of one member of a compound word, in this case *Regenschirm*. It is the suppression of one member of the compound that brings about the semantic change for the part not suppressed. The word *Schirm* would never have had the meaning 'umbrella,' if the word *Regen* had not at one time associated itself with it and limited its meaning. One cannot, therefore, speak of a specialization of meaning, as if this were a matter of several stages of narrowing. The special meaning is there the

[1] Paul, *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*.

[2] Wundt, *Völkerpsychologie. Die Sprache*, II.

moment the limiting word is used. The limiting word is left out and the simple form at once assumes the meaning of the compound. But while Wellander lists this type among the non-elliptical omissions, he is himself in doubt as to whether it might not also be a form of his second type of ellipsis (see below). He freely admits, however, his inability definitely to classify many forms of omission, so that numerous examples are found as illustrations of two or more types.

Ellipsis he defines as the partial or complete omission of the common element in two corresponding syntactical constructions. He differs from other writers on syntax in regarding it not as the result of a completed syntactical process "als Ergebnis eines abgeschlossenen Processes," but as a syntactical function. Not the omission itself is the important fact, but the processes causing this omission. Ellipses are of two types: (1) the two members combine forming a loose syntactical construction but without a corresponding semantic union; (2) the members combine forming a close syntactical union with more or less unified meaning. The first of these types does not, for the most part, affect the development of meaning, which makes the work of more importance syntactically than semantically. And yet it is easy to understand why the author had to include it in a comprehensive outline of the ellipsis. A discussion of the second type of ellipsis, which is of especial importance for semantic development, is promised us for the near future and will no doubt constitute Part III of the studies. Judging from the keen analysis, the thoroness and originality characterizing the first two parts, we may expect a valuable contribution to semantic study in what is to follow.

Sperber's work purports to be an introduction to the study of semantics. His object is not to build up a complete system, but rather to indicate certain methods of approach to the subject. Students of semantics familiar with his former works and articles will recognize in this study rather a restatement and résumé of his contributions to semantics, than any new matter of importance. Some ten years ago he published his most important contribution: *Über den Affekt als Ursache der Sprachveränderung* (Halle, 1914). In this he sets up the thesis that changes in meaning come about thru one cause and only one, viz. *feeling* (Affekt).

Ideas proper are not active principles capable of calling forth changes in themselves, such principles are, however, a part of the emotions accompanying ideas. A word in a certain combination becomes "surcharged with feeling" (*affektbetont*) and in that state only will it have a tendency to change its meaning. An example of almost universal application is the recent word *bolschewik*. The association of this word with certain emotions causes it to bob up into consciousness much more frequently than a word in which the emotional factor is less strong, with the result that this gives rise to its use in situations quite different from those which called forth its first use. So the term may be applied to any number of individuals one does not like and its meaning limited only by the number of persons to which it is applied. This is only one of numerous examples Sperber gives to illustrate this psychic phenomenon. Undoubtedly he has here hit upon an important semantic fact, but when he insists upon emotion as the only decisive factor in all changes in meaning, he goes too far.[3] Wellander, in the work discussed here, has shown that a new meaning may arise in the case of ellipsis or word-reduction. As soon as the *Regen* of *Regenschirm* or the *Schreib* of *Schreibfeder* is omitted, the simple form *Schirm* or *Feder* immediately takes on a new meaning. Where is there any emotional factor in the omission of the first element of the compound?

Another fact upon which Sperber lays considerable stress is what he designates as *Konsoziation*, a term he borrows from Noreen's *Vårt Språk*, and which we may render by *co-association*, altho we admit the pleonasm in the compound. The co-associations are the accompanying ideas or feelings, whether conscious or unconscious, associated with the use of a word. These associations are just as important for the development of meaning of the word as the principal meaning itself and must be taken into account in any thoro investigation of its semantic history. Sperber's examples of these associations are all taken from Middle High German writers. Thus Wolfram von Eschenbach co-associates *herze* and *ougen* in a large number of passages. If the

[3] In a recent article in the *Zs. d. A.*, vol. 59, p. 53, note, he goes so far as to challenge any one to name a single instance where the emotional factor plays no part in semantic change.

connecting link were then, as is likely, a word like *Träne,* the association would clearly indicate that for Wolfram *herze* had a connotation of sadness.

It is the opinion of some linguistic scholars that while there undoubtedly are laws governing semantic phenomena, it is questionable whether they will ever be discovered. Some doubt such laws altogether.[4] Wellander, in the above work (pp. iv, v), believes there are laws, but since we are only at the beginning of semantic investigation, at the stage where we are still trying to determine types of semantic change, there are many steps to be taken before we can hope to come upon traces of semantic laws. Sperber, however, does not hesitate to formulate such a law. Developing further his idea of co-association, he observes that concepts strongly emotionalized show a tendency to persist in consciousness. So a person for whom, for example, the word *music* was emotionally emphasized (*affektbetont*), would be likely to use for an idea '*agreement*' a word like *harmony* or *accord,* etc. This psychological tendency Sperber formulates into the following law: "If at a certain time a complex of ideas (*Vorstellungskomplex*) becomes so strongly emotionalized that it forces one word beyond the limits of its original meaning and causes it to take on a new meaning, then one may definitely expect that the same complex of ideas will force other expressions belonging to it to overstep the limits of their semantic use and will lead to the development of new meanings." The author has apparently so far applied his law only to show the influence of the special vocabularies in which the emotionalized words originate, on the general vocabulary. Thus, if we take the military language, we find that at certain periods such words as *bestürmen, Ausfall, untergraben,* etc., becoming emotionalized, developed meanings which, as a result of the functioning of the law, became part of the general vocabulary.

Unfortunately Sperber vitiates the good impression of the really constructive parts of his work by his polemical tendencies against those who differ from him, especially against Wellander. He opposes not only a number of the latter's classifications, but rather

[4] Compare, for example, Nyrop, *Grammaire historique de la langue française* IV, § 112, and Saussure, *Cours de linguistique générale*, p. 135.

superfluously takes up the cudgels in behalf of Meringer and his socio-historical linguistic investigations (*Sachforschung*), apparently mainly because Wellander had regarded them as rather exaggerated as far as their semantic value was concerned. What purpose have controversies of this sort in an *Introduction to Semantic Study?*

SAMUEL KROESCH.

University of Minnesota.

Ver y No Creer; a Comedia Attributed to Lope de Vega. By GEORGE I. DALE. Reprinted from *Washington University Studies.* Vol. XI, Humanistic Series, No. 1. 1923.

This edition is the result of the collation of an anonymous MS. in the Biblioteca Nacional at Madrid with the printed version of a play of the same name published in the spurious *Parte veinticuatro de las Comedias del Fenix de España Lope de Vega Carpio, y las mejores que hasta aora han salido,* published in 1632 by Jusepe Ginobart, "mercader de libros." Although all of the plays in this volume are attributed to Lope, only four are known to be his, two belong certainly to Ruíz de Alarcón, and one to Matías de los Reyes. This spurious publication under Lope's name seems to have been the principal ground for attributing the authorship of this play to him, succeeding commentators seeming to have been contented to take the word of Jusepe Ginobart at its face value—including La Barrera, Paz y Melia, and Durán.

The MS. which serves as the basis of the present edition is Catalogue Number 2364 in the Biblioteca Nacional; it is anonymous, and bears "aprobaciones" of August 5 and October 16, 1619. Only the last folio, bearing the "aprobaciones" and the last fourteen verses of the play (which are not in Lope's hand), belong to the MS. as originally approved; the remainder of the play is written in several hands of the eighteenth century. The identity of the author is nowhere implied, either in the "aprobaciones" or in the body of the play.

The play itself is of such little value, either bibliographical or literary, that it is doubtful that its publication can be brought to serve any useful purpose. If it is Lope's—which, by the editor's

frank admission, is at best open to doubt—it can scarcely be hoped that it will throw any new light upon his work. But the MS. is not of the seventeenth century, its authorship is a matter of supposition and conjecture, and the only patently genuine thing about it is the official approval of the authorities.

The publication of the play under Lope's name in the spurious *Parte veinticuatro* of 1632 argues nothing; Lope's reputation as a popular dramatist was utilized commercially over and over again by booksellers and "autores de comedias" alike, and nothing was more common in the Golden Age than the publication of polygenetic collections of plays of unknown or obscure authorship, the only bid of which for public favor consisted in their claim to have proceeded from the hand of the Fénix.[1]

The following interior evidence is adduced by the editor in support of Lope's authorship:

The play is in Lope's style. This is important, if so; but it should be borne in mind that while Lope was capable of producing wildly extravagant plots, his most riotous extravaganzas never succeeded in being dull. And *Ver y no creer* is dull to a superlative degree; the action is unmotivated, the entrances and exits wooden and mechanical, the complication unreasonable and ridiculous—the dénouement particularly being brought about in a fashion that outrages reason.[2] It is argued that, assuming the play to be Lope's, it must belong to an early period; but, without the necessity for commentation upon the proper precedence of cart and horse, it is

[1] "Mais pour quiconque veut bien réfléchir à la facilité avec laquelle, au dix-septième siècle, une pièce était attribuée à tel ou tel auteur par un imprimeur ou par un libraire, il ne saurait être douteux que la présence du nom de Lope en tête d'une comedia non publiée par lui ne constitue à elle seule ni une preuve, ni un commencement de preuve, ni même une présomption. Elle signifie simplement que l'éditeur la lui attribuait, de bonne foi ou dans le seur espoir de la mieux vendre. Il suffit de se rappeler le grand nombre d'attributions erronées qui n'ont pas d'autre origine pour être édifié sur la compétence de ces 'attributeurs.'" R. Foulché Delbosc, "La Estrella de Sevilla," *Revue Hispanique*, XLVIII, 530 f.

[2] Lope's *La desdichada Estefanía*, the complication of which, though with a tragic *desenredo*, is a parallel of that of *Ver y no creer*, furnishes an interesting and instructive contrast in the masterly manner in which the same theme is handled. *La desdichada Estefanía* was published in 1619, the date of the MS. of *Ver y no creer*. Cf. the Real Academia's edition of Lope's *Obras*, VIII.

to be noted that comparison of *Ver y no creer* with plays of Lope's earliest period results in no advantage.[3] At the time when Lope was supposedly engaged in the confection of this dull monstrosity, he was writing plays of such dramatic and literary worth as *La pobreza estimada, Los comendadores de Córdoba, El testimonio vengado,* and *Adonis y Venus,* all of which, on Lope's own authority, antedate 1603, and are fairly representative of his earlier period.

Employment of *commedia dell' arte* tricks. Lope drew many of his devices from the Italians, but the influence of the *commedia dell' arte* is to be seen in the Spanish drama from the beginning to the close of the Golden Age. The plays of Lope de Rueda, Juan de Timoneda, Cristóbal de Virues, and, later, those of Lope's contemporaries and successors, show as much patterning after the Italian school as do those of Lope himself.

Use of mythological and classical references. This was a general literary convention of the period, and was not at all individually characteristic of Lope. It is to be noted, not to make the list too prolix, in the works of all of the authors above cited, and was not at all confined to the drama or to Spain, but extended throughout the literature of the Renaissance.

Italianate names of lovers. Lope often used affected Italianate names for his principals in plays of the "romance" type; but he was less addicted to this use than was Calderón. Tirso de Molina, Andrés de Claramonte, Guillén de Castro, Ricardo de Turia, Gaspar de Aguilar, and the Canón Tárrega also show a fondness for Italianate names. There are only two Italianate names in *Ver y no creer*—Fabio and Leonora.

The figure of the hero's servant, so important a one in Lope's plays, cannot be adduced as a proof of authorship; this personage, by name Clascano, a soldier who attaches himself to the hero's fortunes toward the middle of the first act, is weak, supine, and stupid; he does nothing to advance the intrigue, and only once does he make a flaccid attempt to be humorous. Lope developed the part of the hero's servant as an important agent in the promotion of the intrigue; as early as 1603 he was witty, resourceful, commentative, the satirical critic and the ingenious promoter of

[3] For purposes of comparison, the plays listed in the prologue of the first edition of *El peregrino en su patria* (1604) furnish a fair basis.

his master's love affairs.[4] There are many early plays of Lope in which there is no comic servant; but I know of none in which the figure is introduced without being given an important part in the development of the intrigue. Nor do I know of any one of Lope's plays in which the figure, if it occurs, is not introduced early in the course of the action.

In the edition under discussion, one would have preferred that more attention should have been paid to the many and obvious lacunae, while the notes on versification might well have been more extended in their scope, particularly as regards the correspondence of the use of verse forms in *Ver y no creer* with Lope's practise during the period in which the play was written.

It is difficult to see that any useful purpose is to be served by the attribution of this work to Lope or to any other, considering the tenuous quality of the evidence upon which any conclusion must rest, and the utter lack of intrinsic value in the play itself. However, the printed version of 1632 and the eighteenth-century MS. reproduced by Professor Dale may be conceded to have some value as examples of the dramatic hack-work of the Golden Age.

W. A. WHATLEY.

The Ohio State University.

Der Traum in der deutschen Romantik. Von PHILIPP LERSCH. München: Hochschulbuchhandlung Max Hueber, 1923. 70 pp.

It might well be asked whether the study of German Romanticism has not in the past been directed too much to large, comprehensive aspects, that is, to the movement as a whole, and whether more particular points and details, the minutiae or *Bausteine,* have not been somewhat neglected. Indeed, there is reason to believe that if the long list of general treatises beginning with Haym had been preceded by a still longer list of special monographs, our ideas about Romanticism would today be clearer and more fixed.

[4] Cf. the Tancredo of *La pobreza estimada,* the Galindo of *Los comendadores de Córdoba,* and the Hortensio and Belardo of *La fuerza lastimosa,* all of which plays belong to the period before 1603.

From this point of view the work of Lersch, although belated, is quite valuable.

Starting with the purely rationalistic conception of the dream during the age of Enlightenment, the author traces, through Herder and Jean Paul, a gradually changing attitude, culminating in the Romantic point of view, which regards the dream as the archetype or *Urbild* of all true poetry. This idea is described as arising in direct opposition to that of the Rationalists. With these premises, the Romantic interpretation of the dream is considered from two aspects, viz., the dream as life, that is, its reality for the inner, spiritual man; and life as a dream, that is, the unreality and incomprehensibility of life for the external, conscious man (compare Schopenhauer).

The author's purpose to restrict his investigation to G. H. von Schubert and the Older Romanticists (p. 7) has not been consistently carried out. He has included some discussion of E. T. A. Hoffmann and Eichendorff and dwelt at greater length upon Kleist. This is not to be deprecated, for neglect of Kleist, especially, would have made the study very fragmentary and inconclusive. In the relation of Strahl to Kätchen, Lersch discovers suggestions of the relation, imperfectly developed, between the somnambulist and the magnetiser (p. 36). In *Homburg* he recognizes the intention on the part of Kleist to have the hero conceived as a somnambulist. Although it will be difficult for many to subscribe entirely to the author's reasoning on these pages (pp. 35-38), his summary seems correct (p. 38): "Aber jedenfalls ist zu erkennen, dass des Dichters Interesse auch hier (i. e., in *Homburg*) wie im Kätchen letzten Endes der dichterisch-symbolischen Kraft galt, die in der Darstellung von Traumzuständen für ihn gelegen war."

The effective point of departure which Lersch uses for his exposition is (p. 9) that Romanticism seeks to comprehend the world not as a concrete object (*Gegenstand*) but as a condition (*Zustand*). In conceiving his problem in this manner, he furnishes us with a new point of view from which to consider the great antithesis embodied in Classicism and Romanticism. We have become accustomed to finding this antithesis described by such contrasts as 1) the state of being (*Sein*) and 2) the state of becoming (*Werden*); 1) the finite or the consummate and 2)

the infinite; 1) fulfilment and 2) yearning; 1) the Apollinian and 2) the Dionysiac; or 1) the masculine and 2) the feminine. Lersch adds to these the conception just mentioned. Furthermore he establishes a parallelism between Classicism and the state of being awake, on the one hand, and Romanticism and the state of dreaming, on the other.

The main emphasis of the work falls upon Tieck and Novalis. With both the dream is, of course, immensely popular. But for Novalis it transcends its dream-nature and becomes life—a means of peering through the veil of earthly existence into the Great Beyond; Tieck, on the other hand, always remains conscious that it is a dream. In somewhat analagous manner the imaginative power of the two poets in general is contrasted (p. 51). Unfortunately there is no discussion at all of one of the most remarkable of Tieck's *Kunstmärchen,* namely, *Die Seele,* a striking tale in which the soul of the sleeping hero temporarily leaves its body in the form of a mouse, only to return after it has made a wonderful discovery, which is meanwhile communicated to the sleeper in a dream. In the opinion of the reviewer this story throws more light upon Tieck's treatment of the dream and his attitude toward it than any passage noticed by the author.

The last section of the work, from page 56 on, dealing with dream reminiscences in the Romantic *Märchen* and drawing an excellent analogy with Tieck's satirical dramas (pp. 62 ff.) is perhaps the most valuable portion of all.

It is to be regretted that a study of some intrinsic value such as this should be marred by frequent lack of specific references and by poor proof-reading. The first-mentioned objection is illustrated by the casual paraphrase (p. 16), without definite reference, of the following words of Siegfried in Tieck's *Genoveva,* which represent as clear an anticipation of a phase of the Freudian suppressed desires as one could wish for in literature:

> Wie man im Traume oft die eignen Wünsche
> Zum innigsten Entsetzen kennen lernt.
>
> (Tieck, Cotta ed., II, 134).

As for proof-reading, punctuation especially has suffered. Over three dozen necessary commas are omitted. Besides there are at least fifteen other obvious typographical errors.

Indiana University. EDWIN H. ZEYDEL.

Ferdinand Brunetière et la Critique Littéraire, par WALTER JÉQUIER, Thèse, Lausanne, 1922.

M. Jéquier has an intuition of "the infinite otherwiseness of things," and so when he comes in contact with Brunetière's conviction of unity he reacts,—with something of the militant intransigeance which characterizes the subject of his attack.

Not that there is any philosophy in the intention. The author will not study, he tells us in the Introduction, the intellectual or ethical or religious evolution of Brunetière (for these we are referred to Victor Giraud); he will not even consider ideas on literary criticism except from the point of view which Brunetière always took, *le point de vue logique.* Did Brunetière succeed in proving anything? This is the single issue that M. Jéquier deliberately raises. But it is obvious, as one peruses the book, that the writer continually deals with generalizations which force him to break bounds.

As to many details (which, if our definition is right, are what primarily interest M. Jéquier), in a style that a superabundance of dashes, varied by rows of dots, renders a little choppy (perhaps this too is a problem in unity), he makes good points. He reveals a significant inconsistency in Brunetière's judgments of Rousseau and an important contradiction in Brunetière's assessment of Balzac and Flaubert; he objects validly to the speed with which Brunetière read his documents; he ably attacks Brunetière's objections to impartiality in criticism (in spite of himself M. Jéquier approaches general ideas); he wisely allies himself with Goethe and Sainte-Beuve on the matter of sympathy in criticism. There is a suggestion here and there less of sympathy than of petulance, born no doubt of his irritation at Brunetière's philosophy.

For do what he will M. Jéquier cannot avoid the main issue. It becomes very clear that he himself, on the subject of literary values, is completely a relativist, so completely that with a downrightness not unlike Brunetière's he asks who today could be anything else, and with a power of exclusion not unlike his author's he is unaware of such critics as Maurras, Lasserre, Belloc, More and Babbitt. And the result of this fundamental if not explicit objection to Brunetière's doctrine is a hostile appraisal of the author of the *Discours de Combat.* Had M. Jéquier admitted the

issue and had he granted that there are two sides he might have dealt with the subject in a broader manner.

Consider for example an essay of Brunetière's which lends itself to such scientific discussion as is normal in a thesis, that on *le Caractère Essentiel de la Littérature Française.* It contains characteristic inconsistencies; in the manner to which M. Jéquier, with his respect for the integrity of material, properly objects, Brunetière (be it said without impugning his sincerity) is manipulating the evidence. But, discounting this, Brunetière arrives at a generalization which compells attention and has a degree of validity, and his style here as elsewhere has a bracing quality which, altho M. Jéquier is not prompt to recognize it, may be counted a real contribution to French criticism. And the conclusion to which Brunetière comes, as a little interpretation and the admission of the existance of main issues will show, is a revelation of his essential, and important, doctrine. The bond of the social (*le caractère essentiel*) is the bond of common humanity, the idea of common humanity is close to the idea of a permanent human element, and this brings us to the Brunetière absolute, "an absolute based on the unity of the human spirit as it has manifested itself in history."[1]

The humanism of Brunetière, whatever be one's personal judgment of it, is a significant historical phenomenon, in a century the chief tendency of which had been in the opposite direction, of which it had been the principal activity to put man into nature. An investigation of it and a placing of Brunetière historically would be an important part of a complete study of Brunetière's literary critism, and should commend itself to M. Jéquier, who has historical perspective, who knows about the critics of the eighteenth century, beginning with Du Bos, and is well acquainted with the modern period.[2] Furthermore a recog-

[1] Babbitt, *Masters of French Criticism*, Boston, 1913, p. 328. Frequent references in Brunetière's article to "l'intérêt proprement humain" and to "cet homme universel" show the persistence of this conception in the critic's mind.

[2] Altho the reviewer thinks, contrary to M. Jéquier, that Brunetière is right in insisting upon the pioneer character of the criticism of Sainte-Beuve. M. Jéquier makes the usual mistake about the meaning of Buffon's *le style, c'est l'homme* (p. 149); he takes Buffon to be relativistic, where-

nition of the existence of this humanism throws an entirely different light upon certain claims of Brunetière to objectivity, upon his attempt to approach a universal. As M. Jéquier points out, Brunetière cannot deny a subjective quality in criticism. But if one accepts the notion of similar sensibilities in a series of subjects—of a common reaction of their common humanity—the words subjective and objective are less pertinent, and to insist upon them is to insist upon conceptions which for the opponent in the debate are not valid. The debaters are arguing in different dimensions.

Another consideration not stressed by M. Jéquier is the psychology of Brunetière, yet a writer whose favorite remark is: "Je ne suis pas du tout de cet avis" has a twist in his mentality not to be neglected by a student of his criticism. There remain also a host of problems personal but not necessarily becoming mere gossip; if some of Brunetière's criticism was colored by his personal hates, as the author of the thesis says ("affective and not logical") the details of these should be scrutinized in a historical, scientific spirit—no less could be demanded of so good a relativist as M. Jéquier. Perhaps in a later work he will extend himself in these directions.[8]

HORATIO E. SMITH.

Amherst College.

Thomas Hardy's Universe. A Study of a Poet's Mind. By ERNEST BRENNECKE, JR. London: Fisher Unwin.

It is an agreeable habit of those who seek to interpret Mr. Hardy's work to confine their discussion to a single phase of his genius. From the earliest criticism of the novels by Lionel Johnson, now the classic among Hardy studies, to the latest discussion by Mr. Brennecke there has been more detailed research than is

as Buffon's point of view is altogether different. Cf. the *examen critique* in Hatzfeld's edition of the *Discours sur le Style*, Paris, Lecoffre, 1872, especially p. xii.

[8] In a definitive work he should include a bibliography and an index. Misprints in the volume are few; we have noted: p. 3, *dour*, read *pour;* p. 27, *lde*, read *de;* p. 60, *artitisque*, read *artistique;* p. 90, *constestons*, read *contestons*.

common in the studies of a living writer. Mr. Hardy's novels, presenting with epic scope and unity of design a modern *tragédie humaine,* have very widely appealed to critics; his poetry less widely. But it is quite remarkable that the one field in which Mr. Hardy has generally been granted supremacy, at least since Browning, that of philosophical poetry, has to the present received only rather uncritical attention.

Mr. Brennecke has set out to accomplish for the philosopher what his predecessors did for the technician, novelist, and poet. As a critic of Mr. Hardy's thought, Mr. Brennecke's way is obviously beset with pitfalls, of all the most treacherous, perhaps, the tendency to attach ready-made labels to whatever he finds. But Mr. Brennecke treads warily; he recognizes that a poet and a professional philosopher can never be the same; and his definition of philosophy in this study of Mr. Hardy, as "the prevailing colour and composition of the screen through which he views the world in his writings," surely promises much. To get the perspective for his study, Mr. Brennecke chooses Schopenhauerian lenses. The choice is, of course, not arbitrary, for many critics before Mr. Brennecke have noticed that Schopenhauer and Mr. Hardy have stood agreed at certain points. Much of the book is devoted to tracing, especially in *The Dynasts,* the five attributes of the Will, as set down by Schopenhauer. The most telling examples are found in connection with Mr. Hardy's urging the aimlessness and unconsciousness of the Will:

> Why prompts the Will so senseless-shaped a doing?
> I have told thee that it works unwittingly,
> As one possessed, not judging.
> . . . .
> Why doth It so and so, and ever so,
> This viewless, voiceless Turner of the Wheel?

Although the reader may find too much Schopenhauer in the early chapters, he will find by no means dull reading, for Mr. Brennecke is an accomplished and a zealous student of his subject. More directly to the purpose is the finely conceived chapter, "A Metaphysical Biography of Thomas Hardy," in which the critic shows the essential unity of Mr. Hardy's thought. Even the casual reader of the Wessex novels must be struck with the frequent use of such expressions as, "it chanced," "it so happened"; and Mr. Bren-

necke's discussion of those "purblind doomsters," time and chance, shows how Mr. Hardy's philosophical habit inclines him to combine the slightly considered things of life again and again into a plausible basis for tragedy. The dainty Elfride, whose charms Mr. Hardy is at pains to discredit, represents the capriciousness of chance in confounding two capable men. Like the Greek sceptics, Mr. Hardy contends that man's greatest trials result from the inconsequence rather than from the consequence of things. This is particularly noticeable in his treatment of the physical and moral wearing down of charcter, for unlike Zola and his school, Mr. Hardy is never anxious to stress an inherent weakness which might serve to bring about ultimate destruction, but lets his character go down in an unequal warfare with circumstances. Mr. Brennecke's method is not to present his evidence in incontrovertible mass; in fact, had he wished it he might have filled a lengthy chapter with examples of disaster and unhappiness which attend the delivery or non-delivery of letters, though in touching many representative phases of Mr. Hardy's thought his brevity is occasionally not very convincing, as in his discussion of Mr. Hardy's conception of love and woman.

Having so far considered Schopenhauer and his ways in Mr. Hardy's work, Mr. Brennecke is doubtless rather put to it when he comes to the question of pessimist or optimist. Mr. Hardy has several times let it be known that he does not relish being called a pessimist; Mr. Brennecke after slight hesitation fortifies himself with what comfort he can against the idea that Mr. Hardy is one, wholeheartedly. But with an eye to his definition of philosophy, Mr. Brennecke is content to let Mr. Hardy speak for himself, in the conversation reported by Mr. Archer: "My pessimism, if pessimism it be, does not involve the assumption that the world is going to the dogs, and that Ahriman is winning all along the line. On the contrary, my practical philosphy is distinctly meliorist. What are my books but one plea against 'man's inhumanity to man,' to woman—and to the lower animals . . . ? When we have got rid of a thousand remediable ills, it will be time enough to determine whether the ill that is irremediable outweighs the good." Mr. Brennecke further supports the meliorist view by calling attention to the passage in *The Dynasts,* where the Will, at length grown conscious, "fashions all things fair"; and he very justly concludes,

"Hardy's basic optimism, paradoxical as that expression must sound to his superficial readers and critics, may best be observed in his underlying humanity, in the ground-tone of pity that sounds through all his work."

Mr. Brennecke's merit as a critic is that he keeps on the windy side of crystallized opinion and theory, and has permitted Mr. Hardy the rich individuality he deserves.

A. L. Carter.

Pennsylvania State College.

CORRESPONDENCE

Imogen and Neronis

Some years ago,[1] I pointed out what still seems to me to be a close parallel in *Cymbeline,* III, 5, IV, 2,[2] to *The First Part of Jeronimo,* II, 2, 4.[3] A portion of the resemblance of these passages lies in the mistaking of the corpse of an unfavored suitor who has disguised himself in the clothing of his successful rival, for that of the fortunate man. The errors in identification in *Cymbeline* and *Jeronimo* are made by the ladies whose love is sought.

A play earlier certainly—perhaps much earlier—than either *Cymbeline* or *Jeronimo* contains an incident which in its outlines presents a possible source for the passages noted above in one drama or the other, or, it may be, in both. This is *Sir Clyomon and Sir Clamydes,* which was once assigned to Peele. In this comedy, or, more properly, tragicomedy, scs. 11, 12, 15, 16, 18,[4] are those which may have influenced Shakespeare. The Princess Neronis loves, and is loved by, Prince Clyomon. They exchange vows, and Clyomon leaves the court of Neronis' father, the King of the Isle of Marshes. Thrasellus King of Norway, who is in love with Neronis, having been refused her hand, abducts her; but in man's attire she escapes from him, and takes refuge with Corin, an old shepherd. Learning of the deed of Thrasellus, Clyomon sets out to rescue Neronis. He meets Thrasellus whom he slays. Aided by Corin, Clyomon inters the body of Thrasellus, hanging his own golden shield and his sword over the grave with an inscription on

[1] In "Some Parallels to Passages in *The First Part of Jeronimo,*" *M. L. N.*, April, 1912.

[2] Shakespeare's *Complete Works.* Ed. by W. A. Neilson. "Cambridge" Edition.

[3] Kyd's *Works.* Ed. by F. S. Boas, Oxford, 1901.

[4] Peele's *Works.* Ed. by A. H. Bullen, Boston, 1887.

the former in which are related the circumstances of the combat. After Clyomon and Corin have left the spot, Neronis, still in disguise, enters, sees the shield of Clyomon, but overlooks the inscription, and therefore believes her lover slain, and buried in the grave. She is about to commit suicide with Clyomon's sword—after singing a song,—when Providence descends and stops her, assuring her that she shall before long see Clyomon, who is not dead.

The points of likeness between *Sir Clyomon* and *Cymbeline* are evident. Two princesses leave their fathers' palaces because of the attentions of unwelcome lovers—one involuntarily, the other voluntarily. Both ultimately take refuge with country folk—one with a shepherd, the other with an apparent forester and his supposed sons. Each princess is followed by the unfavored suitor. In *Sir Clyomon* he is slain by the favored lover; in *Cymbeline* by the brother of Imogen, who is seemingly a woodsman. Then an error in the identification of the dead man occurs in both plays: Neronis believes the grave which she finds to be that of the knight whose arms hang above it; Imogen considers the headless trunk in the clothing of Posthumus, which she discovers, to be indeed that of her betrothed. Imogen, who has been near death previously at the hands of her stepmother and of Pisanio, swoons on the body, to be roused by the entrance of the Roman army; Neronis is dissuaded from suicide only by the personal intervention of Providence.

The scenes of *Sir Clyomon and Sir Clamydes* which present the adventures of Neronis in the forest are much closer to the scenes dealing with the error of Imogen in *Cymbeline* than they are to that in *Jeronimo* in which Bel-Imperia mistakes the body of Alarico for the corpse of Andrea, her lover. In the Shakespearian and pseudo-Kydian plays, the likeness lies in the use of the same dramatic device. There is no very great question of source between the two.

The situation is perhaps different with *Sir Clyomon* and *Cymbeline*. There is a correspondence in the two plays between the events leading up to the mistakes of the heroines, which may be significant. Further, and this is important possibly, there is no trace of Imogen's error of identification in any tale which has been previously proposed as a source of *Cymbeline*.

Consequently, I feel justified in suggesting that, though the parallelism between *Jeronimo* and *Cymbeline* exists, as shown in my earlier article, yet for the true source of the incident in question in the Shakespearian play we may go back to the early romantic drama of *Sir Clyomon and Sir Clamydes*.

R. S. Forsythe.

Northwestern University.

Early French Remarks on American Literature *en masse*

It is the opinion of M. Fernand Baldensperger that the French Romantics clearly distinguished between English and American literature. Undoubtedly; but familiarity with and imitation of both literatures made, on the average, for Romanticism. While English writers came to be very widely discussed about 1820, American writers received notable attention only some seven or eight years later, and American literature in mass was hardly recognized before 1830.

In 1831 it was stated that "les lecteurs français ne connaissent guère la littérature américaine que par les essais fleuris, polis, essentiellement raisonnables, de . . . Washington Irving, . . . et par la poésie extérieure et mobile de Cooper. . . . Ce sont pour nous les deux génies transcendants des Etats-Unis, les représentants du classicisme et du romantisme dans le Nouveau-Monde."[1] The following year, Fontaney, charming poet as well as a competent critic of literature written in English, contributed to the *Revue des Deux Mondes* a noteworthy article[2] on Cooper[3]; also in June, F. de Champagny had, in the *Revue européenne,* a study on Irving's work, wherein he remarked that "deux noms seulement ont passé l'Atlantique"—those of Cooper and Irving; in March, R. (possibly Charles de Rémusat), in reviewing[4] one of Cooper's novels, had said that the author was easily the best of the novelists from the States, but he also named Irving and Paulding[5] and called all three "romanciers anglo-américains." In 1833, Théodore Muret (critic, dramatist and novelist) accounted[6] for Cooper's rapid rise to fame in these words: "Le romancier américain eut le bonheur de venir à propos. . . . Quand on annonça pour la première fois un auteur américain, ce fut une espèce de phénomène, autour duquel la foule s'empressa. . . ." In 1835, B. sent two appreciative articles to the unfortunately short-lived *Revue poétique,* and Philarète Charles, who was the greatest French authority on English and American literature from 1830 till his death, furnished the *Revue des Deux Mondes*[7] with a study entitled "La littérature aux Etats-Unis." Charles maintained that the Americans possessed no literature specially their own (Cooper imitating Scott, Irving following in the footsteps of Addison and Goldsmith); three poets, Bryant, Percival and Dana, deserved mention; three writers, Cooper, Irving and Channing, had become known, the two former cele-

[1] *Revue Encyclopédique,* March, 1831, A. M.'s notice on Brockden Brown's novels.

[2] In the June number, under "Littérature américaine."

[3] Who had been reviewed as early as 1923.

[4] In the *Journal des Débats,* 16th March, 1832.

[5] R. forgot Brown, whose *Wieland* had been translated in 1804.

[6] In *La Quotidienne,* 4th Oct., 1833.

[7] Fourth Series, t. III, pp. 169 ff.

brated, in France. And in 1840 Augustin Thierry,[8] in a letter to George Ticknor, wrote that he would gladly talk with him "de l'avenir littéraire des Etats-Unis qui semblent vouloir prendre sur ce point, comme en tout le reste, leur revanche sur la vieille Angleterre."

After that date, the French critics often spoke of American literature as national and independent.

Oxford. ERIC PARTRIDGE.

NOTES ON ROBERT GREENE'S PLAYS

The following notes are made with reference to J. Churton Collins' edition of *The Plays and Poems of Robert Greene* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1905). They assume also an acquaintance with Dr. W. W. Greg's discussion of the *Orlando Furioso* (in the Malone Society Reprints, extra volume, 1922).

Alphonsvs

287. "The sillie serpent . . . cut in pieces . . . if her head do scape away vntoucht, As many write, it very stranglye goes To fetch an herbe," etc. For this bit of natural history, cp. Roger Bacon, *Opus Majus* (ed. J. H. Bridges, II, 208): "Nam Parisius (*Parisiis?*) nuper fuit unus sapiens, qui serpentes quaesivit et unum accepit et scidit eum in parva frusta, nisi quod pellis ventris, super quam reperet, remansit integra, et iste serpens repebat ut poterat ad herbam quandam, cujus tactu statim sanabatur."

Orlando Fvrioso

516. "He slily haue engraun." Misprint for "*Ile* slily," etc.

671. "Foemineum seruile genus, crudele, superbum." From 'good old Mantuan,' *Ecl.* IV, 110.

790. "Tell me, sweet Goddesse, will Ioue send Mercury to Calipso, to let me goe?" Allusion to Homer, *Od.* v. 13 ff.

948. "My helme forgd by the Cyclops for Anchises Sonne." The text is doubtful; the Alleyn MS. has "My *shield,*" etc. Venus brought Aeneas a helmet as well as a shield, *Aen.* VIII. 620.

1070. "Marsilius, mee Commende." Misprint for "*wee* commende."

1086. "Ile passe the Alpes, and vp to Meroe." It is possibly worth noting that Juvenal mentions the Alps and Meroe together, *Sat.* XIII. 162, "Quis tumidum guttur miratur in Alpibus aut quis In Meroe crasso maiorem infante mamillam?"

Frier Bacon and Frier Bongay

192. "That which is aboue vs pertains nothing to vs." Lac-

[8] See A. Augustin-Thierry, *Augustin Thierry d'après sa correspondance,* 1922.

tantius, *Divin. Inst.* III. 20, 10, "celebre hoc proverbium Socrates habuit: quod supra nos, nihil ad nos."

1482. "The flies *Haemerae*." Apparently the famous insects on the banks of the Hypanis, called *hemerobia* or *ephemera* (Plin. *N. H.* XI, 43, 120; Arist. *Hist. An.* x. 19).

1542. "Three-formed Luna." Horace's 'diva triformis,' *Od.* III, 22, 4; Ovid's 'triformis dea,' *Met.* VII. 94; Seneca's Hecate triformis,' *Phaedra,* 412.

Iames the Fovrth

945. "The pilot in the dangerous seas is knowne: In calmer waues the sillie sailor striues." Cp. Seneca, *Ep.* 84, 34, "Gubernatoris artem adeo non impedit, ut ostendat; tranquillo enim, ut aiunt, quilibet gubernator est."

1738. "The Thracian Stone: for who toucheth it is exempted from griefe." The stone 'Pausilypus' found in the Strymon. Dr. M. W. Croll, in his edition of Lyly's *Euphues,* p. 299, cites it from the pseudo-Plutarchean treatise *De Fluv. et Mont. Nomin.* XI.

1743. "Melle dulcior fluit oratio." Cp. Cic. *Sen.* x. 31, "Etenim, ut ait Homerus, ex eius lingua melle dulcior fluebat oratio."

W. P. MUSTARD.

The Johns Hopkins University.

OLD FRENCH *Wandichet, Guandichet*

In my two editions of the *Espurgatoire saint Patriz* of Marie de France (1894 and 1903) I was unable to identify this word, evidently an architectural term; now, thanks to a note of J. Vising,[1] who is commenting upon *Donnei des Amanz,* v. 905, the obscurity disappears. The lines in Marie should read:

Faite a pilers e a archez,
A volsurs e a wandichez (vv. 689-90)

which I take to mean, 'constructed with pillars and small arches, with recessed steppings and with small, rod-like columns' (whether clustered or not). Marie is describing the elaborate architecture of the "palace" (*aula* in the Latin) which the Knight Owein met with at the outset of his subterranean pilgrimage, and the details given fit well with the idea of Ezio Levi that Marie had first-hand acquaintance with the life of the cloister.

The word (*wandiches* in the unique MS.) is a compound of Germanic *wand* 'rod,' with double suffix, like *tourniquet, goni-*

[1] *Zeits. für franz. Sprache und Litt.*, XXXIX (1912), p. 5.

chon. The line in the *Donnei des Amanz,* emended by Vising: *A wandie falt guandichet,* I take to mean 'A rod (chastisement) is the best way to meet evasion (deception).' OF *gande, gandie* are well known in this sense, as is the verb *g(u)andir,* from which they derive. No doubt something of a pun was intended.

I take this opportunity to print some corrections to the text of the *Espurgatoire,* a few of which appeared upon an Errata slip which failed to be inserted in some copies:

Line 66 *D'altres et par.* 297 *Itels* and delete the variant. 319 *Tuz.* 360 a period. 535 *Pur c'eslirai, par Deu licence.* 591 *Li priur.* 656 *Dunt de diables.* 720 *sa bunté.* 849 *tuz.* 864 *noz.* 947 *de fer.* 1070 *le meinent.* 1077 *E si i aveit.* 1118 *E par cel nun.* 1149 *trestuz.* 1406 *cez.* 1456 *Se nus ne lur.* 1515 *Tute.* 1756 *cumbien.* 1763 *aliege.* 1819 *Descent del ciel, ço li fu vis.* 1838 *Qu'il a eue.* 1849 *revendrez.* 1850 *vus veez.* 1904 *li priur.* 2006 *e nun.* On p. 8, as pointed out by L. Foulet, the sentence should read: a Second Hermit, with whom the First Hermit was anxious to become acquainted. The First Hermit then tells him (the chaplain) of an assembly of devils, etc. In the Latin text: p. 16 *intenderet.* 62 *auxiliante.* 95 *audiui.*

University of Chicago. T. ATKINSON JENKINS.

THE SOURCE OF A FOURTEENTH CENTURY LYRIC

In the introduction to his recent volume *Religious Lyrics of the Fourteenth Century,* Professor Carleton Brown makes the following comment on the lyric entitled by him "Jesus Pleads with the Worlding:" "No. 126 is interesting as a distinctly fresh treatment of the old theme of Christ's appeal to man; the contrast between the fashionable worlding and the pains of the Passion is effectively drawn." [1] Interesting the poem assuredly is,—not, however, as a 'distinctly fresh treatment of an old theme,' but as a sympathetic translation of a passage attributed to St. Bernard which is found in the *Legenda Aurea.* The passage follows:

Bernardus: tu homo es et habes sertum de floribus et ego Deus et habeo coronam de spinis, tu habes chirothecas in manibus et ego habeo clavos defixos, tu in albis vestibus tripudias et ego pro te derisus fui ab Herode in veste alba, tu tripudias cum pedibus et ego laboravi cum meis pedibus, tu in choreis brachia extendis in modum crucis in gaudium et ego ea in cruce extensa habui in opprobrium, ego in cruce dolui et tu in cruce exsultas, tu habes latus apertum et pectus in signum vanae gloriae et ego latus effossum habui pro te. Tamen revertere ad me et ego suscipiam te.[2]

The English poet has rendered his original faithfully in essen-

[1] Oxford University Press, 1924, p. xxi.

[2] Ed. Graesse (1850), p. 227. I have been unable to find the passage in the works of Bernard.

tials, but has wrought of the prose material a metrical unit so complete and of such distinctive character as to justify, in all but fact, Professor Brown's comment.

Bryn Mawr, Pa. BEATRICE DAW BROWN.

BRIEF MENTION

The *Historical French Reader, Mediaeval Period,* of Messrs. Paul Studer and E. G. R. Waters (New York, Oxford University Press, 1924; xii + 470 pp.) is a carefully executed text-book. It contains selections from sixty-five texts, of which nine are in Vulgar Latin, the others being in Old French, and ranging from the Oaths of Strasburg to Commynes. It is characterized by thoroughly prepared texts, revised in some instances from the manuscripts, an extensive and useful glossary, and unusually complete bibliographical information. The last feature is likely to be particularly serviceable at present, as the new edition of Voretzsch's *Einleitung* has not yet appeared, and our bibliographies of Old French literature are all decidedly out of date.

Certain defects, however, will militate against the adoption of the books in University classes in this country. One of these is its high price ($7.00). Another is the fact that the book is intended to serve two purposes, to provide representative selections from Old French literature and "to supply material suitable for instruction in historical grammar." Now, the failure to keep in mind a single definite group of users is a rock on which the editors of more than one otherwise meritorious text-book have struck. In the present instance the twofold object of the book is objectionable in that literary considerations have interfered in the choice and arrangement of linguistic material, and *vice versa.* Some of the Vulgar Latin texts, for example, are not well adapted to illustrate linguistic changes; the Vulgate and Einhard are much less instructive in this respect than a passage from the *Vetus Latina* and more abundant selections from glosses and inscriptions would have been. Again the Old French literary texts arranged as specimens of the various dialects, generally cannot be so definitely dated and placed as the non-literary material given in the third part of Schwan-Behrens. Hence they are less useful for linguistic purposes. From a literary point of view, on the other hand, many scholars object to using short extracts instead of complete texts. In the present book, moreover, there is a division between "standard French" (*i. e., francien*) texts and "Old French Dialects" which is open to serious objection on linguistic grounds. This division, again, separates texts which the student of literature

should study together. One is distressed from either point of view, for instance, to find Marie de France's *Lai des dous amanz,* on p. 88, as a specimen of "standard French" and a passage from Chrétien's *Erec,* on p. 274, as representative of an "Old French dialect." There is an occasional slip in the excellent glossary. Thus, in the sentence from Commynes, "Leur coustume d'Angleterre est que, quant ilz sont au dessus de la bataille, ilz ne tuent riens et par especial du peuple, car chascun quiert leur complaire pour ce qu'ilz sont lors plus fors, et s'ilz ne mettent nulz a finance," *mettre a finance* does not mean to "put to death," but to "put to ransom." Cf. the historical portion of Littré's article *finance* and the *New English Dictionary, finance,* sb.[1] 2b, and *finance,* v., 1.

The Cambridge Book of Prose and Verse, in illustration of English literature from the beginnings to the cycles of romance. Edited by George Sampson. (xxxviii + 438 pp. Cambridge, 1924.) In his *Preface* the editor says, "The present volume offers to general readers a selection of passages to illustrate the first volume of *The Cambridge History of English Literature.* . . . Its sections are named from the titles to the chapters, and its headnotes occasionally quote passages from the text." The book is thus meant primarily as a Companion to the *Cambridge History,* and as such it will undoubtedly be found useful to students who for one reason or another must rest content to read early English literature in anthologies. The editor is especially to be commended for his generous treatment of the Latin literature of the period (the selections from which, like most of those in the vernacular, he gives in Modern English translation). He has not always been as accurate as one might wish, however. Thus, he uses Giles's translation of Nennius, though this is not based on the critical text of the *Historia Britonum.* Again, his rather cautious dating of Badon (p. 207) is not in accord with Lot's authoritative conclusions (in *La Vie de Saint Gildas*). Other instances of inaccuracy are the spellings *Kilhwch* (for *Kulhwch*) on pp. 211 ff., and *Troynt* (for *Troit*) on p. 208, though here he has plenty of company. The editor's statement (p. 434) that *Old English* is an ambiguous term is puzzling. What is the ambiguity? On p. 437 he quotes with obvious approval the following: "the proportion of Romantic words is so great that we may correctly say that the literary English of the period [*circa* 1300] was a mixed language." One fears that this superstition about English as a mixed language will maintain itself to the crack of doom. But such blemishes in matters of detail (limitations of space prevent me from citing further instances) will not keep this anthology from being a book eminently useful to the layman, and to students who are not specialists in medieval literature.

K. M.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XL JUNE, 1925 NUMBER 6

CHAUCER AND THE CHURCH

For years Chaucer's religious views have interested students of the poet. In 1916 appeared a particularly important paper on *Chaucer and Wyclif* [1] by Professor Tatlock in which is shown that the poet in his attitude toward the church often reflects contemporary opinion. Though Tatlock finds it impossible to state definitely Chaucer's views, he does come to the following conclusion: "Toward the church he was critical, though not unusually so, and he was probably not unsympathetic to the concrete criticism directed at her by other vigorous and earnest souls of his day. We have no reason to doubt that he went to mass on Sundays and holy days, and to confession and communion at least once a year; and that at the hour of death he would have been disturbed if he had missed absolution, unction and viaticum" (p. 76). Recently Professor Maxfield has produced fresh evidence indicating that religious thought was not static in the last quarter of the fourteenth century; [2] that really "Wyclif himself passed through a progressive series of views" (p. 67); that the reformer was not, as sometimes thought, a radical but a conservative—"in favor of cutting back to medieval simplicity and purity" (p. 68). Upon the question of Chaucer's personal religion, however, Maxfield merely states that "we shall probably never know" (p. 74).

In previous discussions a valuable document has been overlooked, one that will not only throw light on religious reform but on the poet's relation to the church as well. Moreover, since the document reflects public opinion between 1387 and 1390, its contents become

[1] *Mod. Phil.*, XIV (1916), 65-76.

[2] *P. M. L. A.*, XXXIX (1924), 64-74. G. C. Coulton (*Social Life in Britain*, 197, 249) also warns against assuming that the M. Ages were uniform.

doubly important in any discussion of the religious beliefs of the author of the *Canterbury Tales.*

The document is as follows: "Letter of the king to the pope, reciting that former [3] kings, princes and faithful men of the realm did build and endow churches, and set therein spiritual husbandmen who tilled the Lord's field, that the seed fell upon good land, yielding some thirtyfold, some sixtyfold, and some an hundredfold, but that in these days putting their hand to the plow they have begun to look back, and the land bears thorns and nettles, while by imposts, provisions and reservations general and special made by the papal see, not for appointment of fit shepherds but to heap up first fruits and rob the realm of treasure, false shepherds and hirelings are entering the fold, Christ's sheep are a prey of wolves, the pious alms of the kings etc. aforesaid pass to the pleasures of the unworthy, freedom of election to cathedral churches and elective dignities great and small, collation whereto at every vacancy pertained to former kings, who at the instance of the papal see granted free election by chapters provided they should first crave license of the king to elect and his assent afterwards, which grant was by the papal see confirmed, is now of little or no effect, that if one cathedral church be void five or six bishops are translated in order that he who leaps highest may pay most abundantly and Cæsar's image be brought into the house of God, that the abuse of provision and reservation has gone so far that dignities and the fattest benefices with and without cures are conferred upon aliens, sometimes upon enemies, who reside not nor may reside therein, understanding not the tongue and knowing not their sheep nor by them known, that sometimes dwellers in the realm do enter upon offices of the church contrary to the canons, not having their vocation of God like Aaron but inflamed with ambition with Simon Magus, and that men of letters manifestly fitted for the cure of souls and to profit the king and realm by their counsel public and private, having no hope of advancement, abandon their studies at the universities, the number of the clergy is diminishing, and learning is dying out,[4] that former kings made statutes, that the election should be freely made as aforesaid, that alien persons who would

[3] On the statute of 1351 see Oman, *Polit. Hist. of England,* IV (1906), 120: also Tout, *ibid.,* III (1905), 377. Cf. *infra.*

[4] For the parson in the GP cf. *infra.* Also the clerk in GP may be compared.

not or might not reside within the realm should not be admitted to benefices, and ecclesiastical persons having the right of patronage should use the same according to such ordinance, adding penalties to be executed upon such as should rebel, notwithstanding which the grievance has increased, wherefore in the parliament last holden at London [5] grievous complaint was made by the lords and commons requiring the king, in accordance with the oath taken at his coronation that he should preserve the rights of the crown and the liberties of the realm and church, to cause the said statutes to be observed, and praying the pope as successor as of the chief of the apostles, who took upon him the command of Christ to feed his sheep and not to shear them, to comfort his brethren and not to oppress them, pondering the premises and the devotion and obedience of the royal house, the clergy and the people of the realm, to do away the scandals and perils above rehearsed, so that the king and his people, being desirous to reverence the person of the pope and the church of Rome, may have rest from these burdens not to be borne which oppress the shoulders of his children and may enjoy their ancient liberty. Sealed with the privy seal, and with the seals of John duke of Aquitaine and Lancastre, Edmund duke of York, Thomas duke of Gloucestre, Edward duke of Rutland, Roger earl of March, Thomas earl of Kent, John earl of Huntington, Richard earl of Arundell, Thomas earl of Warrewyk, Thomas earl of Stafford, William earl of Salisbury,[6] Thomas earl of Notyngham marshal of England, Henry earl of Northumberland, John lord Roos, Ralph lord Neville,[7] Thomas lord Clifforde, John lord Lovell, John lord Cobeham, John lord Beaumont barons, John Devereux steward of the household, Thomas de Percy under chamberlain, Richard Lescrope, Henry de Percy, William de Beauchamp, Lewis de Clifford, Edward Dalyngrugge, Richard Stury and Richard Adderbury [8] knights. Dated Westminster palace, 26 May, 13 Richard II (1390).[9]

[5] *I. e.*, Jan. 17 to Mar. 2, 1389/90 (cf. Oman, *op. cit.*, 119).

[6] On his connections with Barking see "Notes on Chaucer's Prioress," *Philol. Quart.*, II (1923), 302 ff.

[7] Brother of the Archb. of York (see *infra*) condemned in 1388 (cf. *Scot. Hist. Review*, XI, 78).

[8] Chamberlain of the queen. Scrope Chaucer knew of because of the S.-Grosvenour controversy.

[9] *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1389-92, 140 f. The original appears in the *Foedera*

This remonstrance, in other words, is against the lack of "spiritual husbandmen." No official of the church escapes censure,—from the lowest to the bishops. So corrupt are conditions that even when a cathedral church becomes vacant five or six bishops are transferred. Simony as a result is widely practiced. Universities, moreover, are suffering, and as a consequence learning is dying out.[10] In view of this alarming situation the Council prays the pope to "feed his sheep and not to shear them,"[11] and give "comfort to his brethren in England and not to oppress them."[12] That this was not simply an official attitude toward the church in 1390 is clear: the Council is merely echoing public sentiment as strongly voiced by the lords and commons at Parliament a few weeks before.[13]

Where did Chaucer stand? The sympathetic portrayal of the Parson as well as the exposure of the regulars implies that he, too, was chiefly concerned with the essence of religion. Naturally, though the point has never been stressed,[14] on this matter, Chaucer would be in essential agreement with the state. It is unthinkable that one with his close court connections should hold very radical beliefs.[15] His prosperity was dependent upon harmony between church and state. Richard's return to power in 1389 meant not only a thwarted Gloucester, but Rome as well.[16] But with Richard's supremacy Chaucer also came out of obscurity. Nor was this unusual: throughout his life the poet's welfare was linked with the crown. Furthermore, his known intimacy with some of the signers of the appeal to Rome (to be discussed presently)—who had also dropped out of sight from 1386 to 1389—arrests attention. Ac-

(Rymer, VII, 672 ff.). The prelates, including Skirlawe, did not sign the petition. (For names of members see *Proc. Privy Council*, ed. Nicolas, I.)

[10] Richard Ronhale, formerly master of "Soler Hall" (cf. *Reve's Tale*), may have been one of the worldly type. He was a clerk in Skirlawe's "room"—in chancery. I hope soon to publish more facts about him.

[11] This is a conventional touch found in earlier petitions (cf. Hughes, *Illustrations of Chaucer's England*, 1918, 190). Professor F. Tupper very kindly called my attention to this reference.

[12] On the political aspect of the quarrel with Rome see *infra*.

[13] It was at the latter part of the meeting of Parl. that this, the most important legislation (cf. Oman, *infra*), was discussed.

[14] Cf., however, Cox, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXXVI (1921), 477, 481.

[15] Cf. Tatlock, 73.

[16] On Wyclif and Gaunt see A. Smith's life of the latter (chap. VIII).

cordingly, there is no reason to think that Geoffrey Chaucer's views on the church differed greatly from those of his intimate acquaintances and his King—especially at a time when one's religion was not dissociated from one's political connections.

Some outstanding facts support this view. In the letter to the Pope complaint was made that "election by chapters . . . is now of little or no effect," and that with a vacancy of a bishopric there is a mad race "in order that he who leaps highest may pay most abundantly." Did the Council have in mind any one offender? Is it possible to single out a particular bishop in an age of ecclesiastical abuses? Seemingly it is. It so happens that there was one notorious case just at this time; a person, moreover, well known in London. Too, this prelate was a native of—as well as prominent in—the community where the poet set the scene dealing with the corruption of the church. It is none other than Master Walter Skirlawe—archdeacon for years of Holderness.

Some facts concerning this ecclesiast were given in *Chaucer's Bukton*.[17] It was there shown that both Skirlawe and Bukton came from the same district (Holderness) and that the former was archdeacon of that region as early as 1359, a position he was still holding until the beginning of 1386;[18] that he not only held various ecclesiastical appointments simultaneously, but was likewise a prominent official in the king's court. Other biographical data may now be given.

In 1359 he received a benefice in Durham, but was to resign his church in (Preston) Bucks.[19] While archdeacon of Holderness he became canon in Howden, York (1362),[20] and in 1370 was given another prebend in the same shire.[21] Though still archdeacon, by 1381 he held the similar office in Northampton.[22] The same year

[17] *P. M. L. A.*, XXXVIII (1923), 123 f. His life in *D. N. B.* is meager; Wylie (*Hist. of Henry IV*, II, 481 ff.) is better.

[18] Jan. 6 he is called "late archdeacon of East Riding" (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1385-9, 96). Feb. 8 the place is given to Wm. de Waltham (*ibid.*, 114). I am unable to learn to which party W. belonged. Hermesthorp had held it in 1363-4 (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1361-4, 473).

[19] *Cal. Papal Regs. Papal Letters*, III, 1342-1362, 604. Bucks was Vache's shire.

[20] *Cal. Papal Regs., Petitions*, I, 393.

[21] Le Neve, III, 184. In 1359 he had been secretary of the Archb. of York (*Cal. Papal Regs., Petitions*, I, 349).

[22] *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1377-81, 623. Le Neve (II, 89; cf. 57) states that he exchanged this for a prebend in St. Martin's-le-Grand in 1383-4.

he became treasurer of Lincoln.[23] In addition to these various offices, he was dean of St. Martin's le Grand (London) from 1376 to 1384.[24] Meanwhile (1381) he, as well as Sir Nicholas Dagsworth and Sir John Hawkwood (the latter a friend of Chaucer),[25] was sent on a mission to the holy see.[26]

That he was living in London during these years (except when abroad) is evident. The will of Edward III was witnessed by him and men in Chaucer's circle.[27] He had been a clerk in the old king's chancery,[28] and was retained by Richard.[29] From 1382 to 1385 he was keeper of the privy seal.[30] Repeatedly he served on commissions in the metropolis: for instance in connection with the dispute over the staple ports (alluded to in General Prologue) in 1389 and 1390,[31] and 1391.[32] Others (in Chaucer's circle) who served were Richard Stury, the Earl of Salisbury, and Richard Ronhale, one-time master of "Soler Hall" (Cambridge).[33]

Additional proof of his London residence (in a document that

[23] Le Neve, II, 89.

[24] *Ibid.*, 371, 619; *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1381-5, 281. His successor was John Bacun, another royal clerk (*ibid.*, 375; cf. 281).

[25] Cf. *Life Records*, Nos. 121, 122, pp. 216-219. Hawkwood, the "famous English free-lance," had married one of Bernabo Visconti's daughters. On Bernabo see *Monk's Tale* and Kittredge, "Date of Chaucer's Troilus" (*Chaucer Soc.*, 1909, 48 n.). Chaucer in 1378 had been sent to Lombardy to interview Hawkwood.

[26] Rymer, VII, 298, 307, 353, 354.

[27] *Test. Vet.*, I, 12. Other witnesses were: the "trusty and beloved" John Burley (fellow ambassador with Chaucer); John de Beverley and John de Salisbury (fellow members of the poet in the king's household); and Chaucer's friends, Vache and Stury.

[28] *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1377-81, 32, 232; cf. 260.

[29] *Ibid.*, 232.

[30] *Ibid.*, 1381-5, 197; cf. 261, 509, 584, 587. See Foss, *Judges*, 1870, 615 f. It is interesting to note that his "servant" was made comptroller (for life) of the customs at Hull (Holderness) in Oct., 1382—five months after Chaucer received the office of Petty Customs (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1381-5, 212). On Hull see Gen. Prol., 404.

[31] *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1388-92, 173 f., 196. London merchants complained that soldiers at the instigation of Roger de Walden, treasurer of Calais, set upon their ships. Walden, one may note, became dean of St. Martin's the following year, a position formerly held by Skirlawe, and given to Ronhale in 1390.

[32] *Ibid.*, 372, 374.

[33] On Ronhale see *supra*.

also illustrates the workings of the church and government of the time) is the following. In 1383 a committee was appointed to audit the account of John Bacun, king's clerk. Those who served were Skirlawe, keeper of the seal, Hugh Segrave, treasurer, Simon Burley, under-chamberlain, Richard Adderbury, chamberlain of the queen, and the barons of the Exchequer.[34] Now one of the chamberlains of the Exchequer was John Hermesthorp—archdeacon of Holderness in 1363 and 1370,[35] who succeeded Skirlawe as dean of St. Martin's! No wonder Langland could write:

> Bischopes and bachelers bothe maistres and doctours,
> . . . .
> Liggen in London in lenten, an elles.
> Some seruen þe kyng and his siluer tellen,
> In cheker and in chancerye (B. 87 ff.).[37]

Skirlawe's frequent missions abroad likewise indicate that his ecclesiastical duties (in the north) were performed *in absentia.* No prelate in his day was sent so often to the continent as ambassador.[38] Strangely enough he seems to have gone for the first time—as did Chaucer—to France in 1377.[39] Equally interesting is the fact that he went at about the same time (the commission is dated two days before), and for the same purpose.[40] The following year he was in France,[41] as well as twice in 1379 [42] and 1379-80.[43] In 1380 he was on two other missions also: in Scotland (with Gaunt) and France.[44] To France in 1381,[45] and Germany,

[34] *Cal. Pat. Rolls,* 1381-5, 291, 335.

[35] Cf. n. 18.

[37] These lines (from 87-204) are not in A. Plurality is condemned in the "Complaint of the Plowman" (*Pol. Poems,* I, 325).

[38] Miss Rickert believes that "lawyers were commonly employed on diplomatic missions . . . to do the work" (*Manly Anniv. Studies in Lang. and Lit.,* 1923, 30). Skirlawe had studied canon and civil law (*Papal Letters, Petitions,* I, 1342-1419, 345, 349). Capes (*The English Church in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries,* 1900, 240) notes that archdeacons received special training, usually in Italian law schools.

[39] Rymer, III, Pt. III, 58; *Life-Records,* 204 n. *Passim,* Bloomfield, *Norfolk,* VI, 385.

[40] *Life-Records,* 204 n.

[41] Rymer, 73, 75; *Bibl. l'ecole des chartres,* LX, 198.

[42] Rymer, 88, 90; *Bibl.,* etc., 201 (*bis*).

[43] Rymer, 97; *Bibl.,* etc., 201 f.

[44] *Bibl.,* 202 (*bis*).

[45] *Bibl.,* 203.

Bohemia and Rome in 1381-2;[46] to France in 1383-4 (with Gaunt);[47] to France in 1384,[48] 1385,[49] 1386,[50] 1388 (with Clanvowe),[51] 1389,[52] and 1390.[53] To Scotland and France in 1392;[54] France in 1393;[55] Scotland in 1394;[56] and, finally to France in 1399, 1400, and 1401.[57]

Though there is, up to this point, no particular reason for thinking that his career was necessarily unusual, two other incidents hint at a connection between him and the appeal to Rome. In 1385 and 1386 there were made two appointments to fill vacant bishoprics that strained the relations between Richard and his Holiness. In each case, moreover, the bishop involved was Skirlawe. By a papal bull of July, 1385 he became bishop of Coventry and Lichfield.[58] Before he could be enthroned, however, the pope transferred him to Bath and Wells, which had become vacant in July (1386).[59] This had taken place (18 August) in spite of the fact that the king's favorite, Richard Medford, had been the choice of the chapter.[60] That the reference in the petition of 1390 to "free election by chapters" can refer to the Bath and Wells episode is therefore possible.

The happenings a few months later sustain this belief. On the very day that the Lords Appellant came into power (April 3, 1388) Skirlawe—who had become this year a member of the king's Council[61]—was transferred by the pope to the powerful see of

[46] *Ibid.*, 204; Rymer, 119.

[47] Rymer, 160, 162; Higden, IX, 24; *Bibl.*, 206 (*bis*).

[48] *Bibl.*, 206.

[49] *Bibl.*, 207 (*bis*). Apparently with Clanvowe.

[50] *Ibid.*, 208.

[51] Rymer, III, Pt. IV, 34 f.; cf. 44, 46.

[52] Rymer, 49; Higden, IX, 218; Wals. (*Hist. Angl.*), II, 179. Clanvowe and Dagsworth (cf. n. 25) were the others.

[53] Rymer, 56 f. Others were Stury, Devereux and Ronhale.

[54] *Ibid.*, 78, 80; cf. 100.

[55] *Bibl.*, 211.

[56] Rymer, 102.

[57] *Ibid.*, 170, 178, 200; cf. 183; also, *ibid.*, IV, Pt. I, 3, 7, 13; *Hist. Angl.* (*op. cit.*), II, 242.

[58] *Cal. Pat. Rolls* 1385-9, 37; Le Neve (I, 551) gives June 28. Wykeham, it may be mentioned, was an arch-pluralist also (cf. *D. N. B.*).

[59] *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 240-2; cf. 245. He held in 1386 the prebend of Milton in Lincoln (Le Neve, II, 187).

[60] Le Neve, I, 139. Richard assented to his election 15 Aug. (1386).

[61] Cf. *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1385-9, 502.

Durham.[62] Yet this place was not empty, for Richard's friend, John Fordham, still held it, though he was on that same day removed to the smaller see of Ely.[63] It is evident, therefore, that Skirlawe was not only the powerful ally of the Gloucester faction but of the pope as well. The stinging papal and political rebuke is manifest; it is only too obvious that both parties were conspiring in Richard's downfall.[64]

[62] Cf. *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1385-9, 504, etc. Arundell became Archb. of York on 3 April also; and on same day John de Waltham became b. of Salisbury, and was consecrated at Cambridge the following Sept.

[63] Le Neve, III, 291. Fordham did his fealty to Richard and made his profession of obedience in Barnwell church at Cambridge in Sept. (1388) (cf. Le Neve, I, 337).

A few facts concerning Durham are worthy of mention. The bishops of D. within their bishopric enjoyed all rights and privileges which the king had in his kingdom. "In D., said a lawyer of the fourteenth century, the Bishop may do as he will, for he is king there" (cf. G. T. Lapsley, "The County Palatine of Durham," *Harvard Historical Studies*, VIII, 1900, 30). He was head of the civil government of the palatinate, and even the prior of D. had his own court "and, up to a certain point, almost exclusive jurisdiction over his men" (*ibid.*, 34). The bishop's household in the Middle Ages was immense, and in the fifteenth century was probably larger than that of an earl, which averaged 130 persons. One of Skirlawe's predecessors had a retinue of 140 knights (*ibid.*, 99 ff.). The bishop had power to appoint his justices of peace (*ibid.*, 178 f.); he had his mintage system (*ibid.*, 280). His income was enormous. Bishop Hatfield in 1369 was robbed of £2500 from his castle, and the only account is the pardon of the robbery in 1385 (*ibid.*, 293 f.). Friars never got a foothold in D., nor were they ever allowed to preach there (*ibid.*, 50). However, Skirlawe remembers them in his will (*Test. Ebor.*, I, 308). *Passim*, "Roll of Skirlawe, Bishop of D. from 1388-1405" in the *33rd Annual Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records*. London, 1872, 43-85.

[64] Other facts in the life of Skirlawe may be given. The date of his birth is unknown, though since he asked to be excused in 1397 (on account of "great age") from attending Parliament (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1396-9, 221), he was probably born between 1330 and 1340. He may have been of humble origin (cf. *D. N. B.*). He went to Oxford (Durham House) where he studied canon and civil law for six years (*Papal Regs., Petitions*, I, 1342-1419, 245, 349).

He was naturally a man of means. In 1383 while living in the parish of "St. Clement Danes without Temple Bar," thieves robbed him of silver vessels valued at 600 marks (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1381-5, 212, 322, 495; cf. 1388-1392, 429). At this time he was lodging at the "inn" of the Bishop of Bath, whom he was to succeed in three years. In the autumn of 1386

What took place immediately after Richard's return (May 3, 1389) amply supports such inferences. One of the King's first acts was to recall Gaunt from Spain. "Preparations for the Duke's return began in August; but delay only increased the King's impatience, and on October 30 a formal summons to return either by sea or land was despatched to the Duke at Bordeaux. A courier reported to the Privy Council that weighty matters touching the custody of Aquitaine had prevented the Duke from returning as he had hoped to do at the beginning of November. As it was, he

when Richard acknowledged debts, Skirlawe was among those who had lent money (£100). Others of interest to students of Chaucer are: the abbess of Barking (£40); abbot of Osney (£50); prior of St. Frideswide (£20) (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1385-9, 227 f.). In 1385 he, Simon Burley and others acquired the castle of Hingham and numerous manors in Essex (*ibid.*, 1381-5, 556 f.); in 1386 at Aylesbury (Bucks) (*ibid.*, 1385-9, 163); in 1391 lands in York (*ibid.*, 1388-92, 431); the manor of Nottingham with others in 1392 (*ibid.*, 1391-6, 57); and, with others, a manor in the city of York in 1397 (*ibid.*, 334).

He was also a man of learning. He wrote a commentary on the Aristotelian treatise of Growth and Decay (*De Generatione & Corruptione*) (A. Wood, *Historia . . . Oxoniensis*, Oxford, 1674, II, 57 f.), a work prescribed for the arts course at Oxford (Ayliffe, *The Ancient and Present State of the University of Oxford*, London, 1723, I, 252). He gave the University many books including his work (for list see *Test. Ebor.*, I, 323 f.; cf. *Munimenta Academica*, ed. Henry Anstey, *Rolls Series*, 34). As a benefactor his name endured. As late as the time of Philip and Mary the form of prayer used in the chapel of University College on the day of the yearly College Festival begins thus: "Merciful God and loving Father, we give Thee humble and hearty thanks for Thy great Bounty bestow'd upon us of this place by Alfred the Great, the first Founder of this House; William of Durham the Restorer of it; Walter Skirlaw, Henry Percy . . . especial Benefactors" (A. Clarke, *Colleges of Oxford*, London, 1891, 1 f.). The basis for this prayer was the founding in 1404 of three fellowships in the University (*Test. Ebor.*, I, 306 f.; Wylie, II, 482. Chaucer's clerk, though doubtless worthy, had no fellowship: cf. Jones, *P. M. L. A.*, XXVII, 107 ff.). Each fellow is to have 40s. yearly, and he shall pray for the king and bishop. On the day of the bishop's death the fellows yearly shall celebrate with *placebo* and *dirigo*, and shall receive 6s. 8d., and the like amount on the day of St. Cuthbert. The fellows are to attend Oxford or Cambridge, and preferably from the dioceses of York and Durham (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1401-5, 377).

He died in 1404 at Howden, the manorial seat of the Bishop of Durham (*Test. Ebor.*, I, 317; cf. *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1405-8, 166), and left a remarkable will. His bequests (to all classes of people) in money were enormous, even

proposed to come back at the beginning of February; if, however, the King required his presence earlier he would obey forthwith, but to guard himself against suspicion and the malice of enemies he requested formal sanction for travelling if necessary overland.

But Richard, fearing some act of violence from Gloucester, refused to wait until February; and on November 19, 1389, John of Gaunt landed at Plymouth."[65]

Exactly three weeks later (Dec. 10) a meeting of the King's Council was held at Reading. "As Lancaster rode thither he was met two miles from the town by the King. Three years and their bitter experiences had worked a change in Richard's estimate of parties and their leaders: the man whose departure in 1386 he had welcomed with ill-concealed satisfaction is now hailed as a deliverer. . . To the King and to each of his suite John of Gaunt gave the kiss of peace, declaring the old quarrels forgotten."[66]

In the meantime (Dec. 6)—seventeen days after Gaunt landed—Parliament was summoned; it sat from Jan. 17 to March 2.[67] The most important legislation, says Oman, was the abuse of papal

in terms of today. To a thousand poor people he gave 13s. 4d. each with which to buy beds and other necessaries (*Test. Ebor.*, I, 313; equivalent today to c. $60,000). He generously remembered the friars, including the Carmelites, brothers Stephen Patrington and Robert Selby (*ibid.*, 313 f.). He built bridges, gates, dormitories, cloisters (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1391-6, 539 f., 581 f.; cf. 553, 555). In 1394-5 he was permitted to found a chantry in Howden, at the altar of St. Cuthbert (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1391-6, 57). He gave immense sums towards the building of the central tower at York, and repaired various churches. In money alone his bequests amounted to c. a quarter of a million dollars.

The will, covering nearly twenty pages, mentions stores of ecclesiastical garments, many of which (like the Monk's) were purfiled with grys; costly vessels of silver and gold,—all of which exhibit the splendor of the see of Durham. He was buried in Durham Cathedral. "The slab, if it now remains, is covered with pews" (*Test. Ebor.*, I, 307 n.).

The following delightful bit may be given. One of his retainers testified at a Lollard suit (in 1401) that S. was a "bit testy." (This was the only time, as far as known, that he attempted to suppress the Lollards; cf. Wylie, II, 482). His autograph is in J. G. Nichols, *Autographs of Royal and Noble Personages*, 10 c.

[65] S. Armitage-Smith, 340.

[66] *Ibid.*, 341. Because of his satisfaction with the Duke, Richard, at the end of the session of Parliament (March, 1390), made John Duke of Guienne (Oman, 120).

[67] *Rot. Parl.*, III, 257-276.

provisions. "The statute of 1351 against those who obtained from Rome the grant or reservation of a benefice or an office, to the detriment of the rightful patron, was re-enacted. Stringent penalties were attached; commoners might be punished for treason; prelates were subject to exile or loss of their temporalties." [68] That the petition to the papal court a few weeks later (May 26) could refer to the "grievous complaint . . . by the lords and commons requiring the king . . . that he should preserve the rights of the crown and the liberties of the realm and the church" was within the bounds of truth. Meanwhile, the important thing to remember is that public feeling in the early months of 1389 was unanimous in its attitude toward papal abuses: evils that culminated with Richard's overthrow in 1386, at the very time when Skirlawe played a leading part.

Among the members of the King's Council in 1389 was at least one intimate of Chaucer,—Sir Lewis Clifford. Since he, as well as some others of the Council, is usually termed a Lollard, further discussion becomes necessary. How can we reconcile the religious convictions of these men with the fact that they were confidants of the King? Would the latter have had about him—at this critical moment—men so heretical that his very purpose would have been defeated? If ever he needed support (witness the warmth of language in the proceedings of Parliament)—and tactful diplomats—it was at this time. Surely he knew what he was about when he picked his body of advisers.[69]

Now these knights, as has been shown,[70] could not have been as heretical as generally thought. That the chroniclers were hostile witnesses is obvious: the strongholds of monasticism were naturally on the defensive, only too eager to give aid to the church. That these three knights, in short, were much more liberal (c. 1390) in their religious views than the court is highly improbable. The age, as said, demanded not religious thought so much as political unity: to this the pages of the *Rolls of Parliament* bear eloquent testimony. And the facts in the lives of these three men support this view.

[68] Oman, 119.

[69] To be sure a spirit of compromise existed. But in choosing knights for his Council the case seems different. Moreover, Clifford was a member of Gaunt's household. Queen Anne was sympathetic with liberal thinkers (cf. Deanesley, *The Lollard Bible*, 1920, 278).

[70] Waugh, *Scot. Hist. Rev.*, XI (1914), 55 ff.

Clifford was a famous man, equally well known in France and England.[71] From youth he had been intimately associated with Gaunt.[72] He was likewise a follower of Richard from the accession (1377). Like Chaucer, therefore, he was on intimate terms with both the Duke and his nephew. He too dropped out of sight in 1386, only to return three years later as one of the King's advisers.[73] Repeatedly thereafter he was on commissions at home and abroad. Among the ambassadors to Paris in February, 1391 to persuade Charles VI "to abandon his projected expedition against Boniface IX" was Clifford.[74] A ticklish mission for a heretic! When Derby was in Prussia (1391) Clifford became his attorney. In 1392 he was an executor of the Duchess of York.[75] He was thoroughly in sympathy with crusades; consequently he could not have been a Wycliffite.[76] Finally, Derby on his Prussian expedition made an offering "in die anniuersarii filii Lowys Clifford"—a pious act with no taint of heresy.

Nor is there anything unorthodox in the life of Sir Richard Stury.[77] His long connections at court are familiar. He too was often on diplomatic missions, and his friendship with Froissart is a matter of history. Like Clifford he was in obscurity from 1386 to 1389.[78] Seemingly complete proof of his religious views appears in the following. In 1392 he likewise (with Clifford) became an executor of the Duchess of York, and was to provide for the repose of her soul.[79]

Sir John Cheyne's career offers nothing contradictory. He was apparently a landed gentleman (itself evidence of conservatism), and MP. Gloucester in 1390, 1393 and 1394.[80] In the latter year he accompanied the King on his expedition to Ireland, later serving the Earl of March there (Chaucer, we recall, had been made forester in 1390 by the Earl). The most important event (from

[71] Kittredge, *Mod. Phil.*, I, 1 ff.; *ibid.*, XIV, 513 ff.; Waugh, *op. cit.*

[72] Cf. *P. M. L. A.*, XXXVIII (1923), 126.

[73] On Vache, Clifford and Stury see *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1389, 92, 301).

[74] Waugh, 59.

[75] *Test. Vet.*, I, 135; cf. Waugh, 60; Kittredge, *Mod. Phil.*, I.

[76] Cf. Tatlock, *op. cit.*, and Maxfield, *op. cit.*

[77] See Waugh for his life.

[78] Waugh, 67.

[79] Cf. Waugh, 66.

[80] See Waugh for facts.

our point of view) has to do with the petition of 1390. It was he who was sent to Rome with letters concerning the new statute, and probably with the petition itself.

What are the conclusions? It is impossible to see wherein these three knights held religious convictions greatly at variance with the King. That they stood for liberal thought, as well as for greater purity within the church, is of course probable. In fact, it is altogether likely that it was partly for this reason that they were chosen royal advisers.[81]

We come now to Chaucer himself! What were his beliefs at this period? Does he anywhere echo the public state of mind? That he was conscious of the turmoil goes without saying; he too had shared the misfortune in 1386. His thorough knowledge of the workings of the church is sufficient proof of his sensitiveness to his environment. Accordingly, it should cause no surprise if he furnished a clue.[82]

[81] Cf. n. 69.

[82] Since the language of the 1390 petition parallels at times that of previous remonstrances, it might be thought that the letter is merely another conventional one. But a comparison will show that the latter one contains more grievances, and in greater detail. Anyway, the fact still remains that Richard seized the reins in 1389, at a time when all devout Churchmen deplored the ecclesiastical evils (cf. Deanesley, *op. cit.*, 229). Now York, as seen, was the center of attack (space forbids my presenting much evidence showing that the government officials at London were in very many instances natives of Holderness and vicinity, and that they held an amazing number of the ecclesiastical preferments in Yorkshire). But the one person in whom is focussed the clash between church and state—at a time when was threatened the very existence of Richard and his followers, including the court poet Chaucer—was Skirlawe, papal favorite and former archdeacon of Holderness. Hence it is unthinkable that the poet's audience was unconscious of these facts. Holderness (cf. n. 85) remained a source of anxiety for some years.

Yorkshire had given trouble before. In 1381 Archb. Neville decided upon a visitation at Beverley (Holderness: cf. Thompson, *Hold.*, Hull, 1824 and map). The canons immediately published a protest, giving as one of their reasons that the Archbishop interfered with their private jurisdiction ("Beverley Chapter Act Book," *Surtees Soc.*, vol. 108, II, 205-265, especially 208, 217; cf. lxxiv ff.). Neville's summoner was Ralph de Selby, king's clerk in the chancery (*ibid.*, 202-4, 258). Only three of the chapter—none of whom was employed at Chancery—took the oath of office. The rest—eight, four of whom were chancery clerks—were pronounced contumacious. The affair was well known at London, for the Archbishop's

In *Bukton* mention was made that the choice of Holderness for a setting was probably not a chance one. It seems possible now to go one step further; for to all appearances the tales of the Friar and Sumner reflect public opinion c. 1390.

The *Friar's Tale* begins,

> Whilom ther was dwellinge in my contree
> An erchedeken, a man of heigh degree,
> That boldely dide execucion
> In punisshinge of fornicacioun,
> Of wicchecraft, and eek of bauderye,
> Of diffamacioun, and avoutrye,
> Of chirche-reves, and of testaments,
> Of contractes, and of lakke of sacraments.
> Of usure and of symonye also.
> But certes lechours dide he grettest wo;
> They sholden singen, if that they were hent;
> And smale tytheres weren foule y-shent.
> If any persone wolde up-on hem pleyne,
> Ther mighte asterte him no pecunial peyne.
> For smale tythes and for smal offringe
> He made the peple pitously to singe.

---

mandate was read at Ludgate and St. Paul's (*ibid.*, 108, 216). The case was, as far as is known, the most notorious of its kind (cf. Capes, *A Hist. of the Eng. Church in the Fourteenth Century*, London, 1900, 236). Now of these four employed at Chancery one was Skirlawe. Since the Archbishop's visitation had been made in March, we probably have the true explanation of Skirlawe's extended visit to Rome that year. His mission to the pope produced its results. Neville (though entirely within his rights, as the canons confessed that no canon kept his residence according to statute, *Beverley Chap. Book*, 248) was condemned by the Lords Appellants in 1388—the only ecclesiast thus accused—and the pope appointed his successor. Neville's visitation was still a live issue with the Gloucester party in 1388: the Parliament (held at Cambridge) stated that the vicars of Beverley, who had also been driven out ("Beverley Chap Book," *op. cit.*, lxxvii; *Victoria Co. Hist. York*, III, 40; *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1385-9, 46), "have led and still lead a miserable existence" ("Victoria," *op. cit.*, 182). As a result, Parliament ordered their reinstatement (*Beverley Chap. Act Book*, lxxxi).

Neville met his fate in 1388, though being a churchman was spared the gallows. The pope transferred him to "schismatic" St. Andrews. But he "could not approach [it] since England and Scotland were at war" (Oman, 110). Meanwhile (June 30, 1390) jurisdiction over the English subjects in the diocese of St. Andrews was given by the pope to Skirlawe ("Scriptores Tres.," *Surtees Soc.*, 1839, clx ff.)!

For er the bisshop caughte hem with his hook,
They weren in the erchedekenes book.
Thanne hadde he, thurgh his jurisdicioun,
Power to doon on hem correccioun.
He hadde a Somnour redy to his hond,
A slyer boy was noon in Engelond.
For subtilly he hade his espialle,
That taughte him, wher that him mighte availle.

The concreteness (with the delicious reference to the archdeacon who punishes simony) of these lines is in Chaucer's best vein. In view of the notoriousness of Holderness, it is difficult to believe that the name was chosen merely for its rhyme.

There is a startling piece of evidence to support this view. Queen Anne upon coming to England in 1381 was given Holderness in her own right.[83] In 1388, however, the lordship was seized by Gloucester.[84] Now church (Skirlawe and other arch-supporters of the pope[85]) and state (Gloucester and his faction) were solidly united in making "mersshy Holdernesse" their spoils.[86] That the

[83] Poulson, *Holderness*, I, 69.

[84] As Duke of Albemarle (his title in 1385) he was technically entitled to Holderness (*D. N. B.*, LVI, 154; Dugdale, *Baronage*, II, 170, is cited).

[85] The archdeaconry of East Riding was, as far as known, not held by S. after 1386 (cf. n. 18). In 1383, however, it was seemingly granted (by the pope) to a Roman cardinal (Le Neve, III, 142; his reference I am unable to identify). (We recall that Skirlawe had been in Rome in 1381 and 1382.) Again July 26, 1389 the same cardinal received the appointment (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1388-92, 91). This was but a few weeks after Richard returned to power. Finally, in 1393 or 94 Wm. Feriby, king's clerk, was granted it (cf. *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1391-6, 391; Le Neve, III, 142). There seems to have been trouble in Feriby's case, too, for he did not actually obtain the place until 1397 (*ibid.*, 1396-9, 62). Feriby seemingly was a follower of Gloucester (*Cal. Close Rolls*, 1385-9, 608).

It should be emphasized that this archdeaconry offered nothing peculiar in having aliens. From the pages of Le Neve, however, one gets the impression that the evil was more wide-spread in Yorkshire than elsewhere. Incidentally, it was also worse after 1376 or 1377.

[86] Is there a further allusion in the tales of the Friar and Sumner to the poverty in those remote parts? Eastern Yorkshire must have been sparsely settled. Not only had the plague taken a heavy toll, but it was so low that much of it was gradually swallowed by the North Sea (cf. Thomas Sheppard, *The Lost Towns of Yorkshire*, London, 1912, 60 ff.). Matters of drainage came up in the 14th c. (Boyle, *History of Hedon*, 73, 75). A reference in an early 17th c. will may be cited in this connection.

poet and the court (which included besides the ruling classes such men as Clifford and Clanvowe)[87] were unconscious of these facts is highly improbable.

Finally, the choice of Cambridge for the setting of the *Reve's Tale* substantiates like inferences. In *Bukton* mention was made of the fact that Gloucester's Parliament met at "Soler Hall" (Cambridge) in September, 1388 and that seemingly the poet's choice of that university town was determined by this fact. Now the reader will recall that the two students were from the north,

> Of o toun . . . . . . that highte Strother,
> Fer in the north (A 4014 f.).[88]

Where in the north? Had the poet any particular locality in mind? To all appearances, yes, if a remark of one of the youths is a clue:

> 'Now, Symond,' seyde John, 'by seint Cutberd' (A 4127).

In other words, the students were from the diocese of Durham.[89] Now Skirlawe had become bishop of Durham April 3, 1388,—the

Provision is made for the maintenance of a schoolmaster at S. Skirlawe (native community of W. S.). The candidate must be university bred, "no Drunkard, no Swearer, no Blasphemer," and unmarried, for "I hold itt unnecessary for a Man living in so barren a place as Skirlaugh is to have the use of a Woman" (Thompson, *Swine*, 186 ff.).

[87] Did Chaucer have in mind, as Skeat says (v. 326), the old joke that the Devil, according to Teutonic mythology, dwelt in the north (cf. *Friar's Tale*, 1380 ff.)? If so, his attack was double-edged. Additional references to Skeat's are the following: Tupper and Ogle (transl.), W. Map's *De Nugis*, 1923, 201. On Blake's views see F. Damon's *Blake*, 1924, 68.

A curious parallel is in the ballad of Robin Hood. Little John says he was born in Holderness (Cambridge ed., p. 263), and Robin Hood is called the yeoman of the forest (*ibid.*, 267). The Devil in the *Friar's T.* was disguised as a yeoman, and dwelt "fer in the north contree" (D. 1413).

[88] Chaucer adds characteristically, "I can nat telle where."

[89] St. Cuthbert's shrine was at D. Cathedral; an altar at Howden. Skeat noted that a Strother family existed in Northumberland, though no town by that name is known. The Diocese of Durham embraced not only the palatinate but Northumberland as well, and some of Yorkshire (Lapsley, *op. cit.*, 116 n., 300). I have found that in 1378 Alan Strother was on a commission to enquire into the defects of a Northumberland castle, which Richard Stury had been keeper of (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1377-81, 127). I hope soon to discuss the background of the *M. of Law's Tale.*

Is it also significant that the Miller (*Reve's T.*, 13) carried a Sheffield (Yorkshire) knife?

very time that Gloucester obtained control of Parliament, and five months before his Parliament met at Cambridge. Not only does the *Reve's Tale* illuminate the poet's outlook on contemporary society,[90] but it strongly reinforces conclusions already drawn in this paper.

Chaucer's attitude toward the established church now seems clear. His sympathies—religious and political, for they were inseparable—were (as we should expect) with Richard's party. In giving the *Sumner's Tale* a local setting, he is following an earlier example. But in the sumner's mention of Holderness there is more; for behind the smile of this prince of humorists also lurks a satiric allusion,[91] a reference to contemporary events that must have moved his hearers—now safely[92] seated in power—to uproarious laughter.

The portrait of the poor parson substantiates the conclusion that the poet was opposed to the vices in the church; for the ideals of this perfect shepherd parallel the views set forth in the protest to Rome.[93] But this remonstrance to the papal court represents (as noted) the enlightened public opinion of the day—in its renewed emphasis upon the essentials of Christ's teachings.[94]

E. P. Kuhl.

Goucher College.

[90] Chaucer's rollicking humor and his apparent indifference towards existing conditions seemingly give point to his philosophy in *Vache*. My conclusions do not clash with views held on dates of the F.-S. tales. It is interesting in this connection to note that Richard moved his court to York city in 1392 (Higden, IX, 267-70).

[91] How much humor did Chaucer's audience see in the fact that it is the Sumner's—not the Friar's—story that is localized at Holderness?

[92] Armitage-Smith, 341. It is interesting—possibly important if we knew all the facts—that Wm. LeScrope had to do penance in 1390 at the shrine of St. Cuthbert for having done "certain trespasses" to Skirlawe. Clanvowe was the King's adviser in the matter (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1388-92, 178).

[93] It might be urged since the description of the poor parson was written c. 1387, that my point is thereby weakened. But by Oct. 1386 England was in a turmoil, and the petition in 1390 was merely the breaking forth of a long-smouldering fire. Anyway, what proof is there that *all* the GP was composed at a stretch? I hope presently to approach this matter from another angle.

[94] One recalls the important position assigned to the *Parson's Tale*.

DANTE NOTES

VII. "Fears No Sops" (*Purg.*, xxxiii, 36)

The She Wolf who in *Inf.*, I, more than any other animal causes Dante, representing humanity, to lose hope of gaining the sunlit heights (line 54) is to be, some fair day, driven by the Greyhound back to Hell, whence Envy first set her loose (line 111). Now Envy, in *Inf.*, XIII, 64-6, is called "the harlot who never took her lewd eyes from the hospice of Caesar, death universal and the vice of courts" *par excellence.* In *Purg.*, XX, pitying those tortured for Avarice, Dante breaks into bitter invective against that "ancient She Wolf," whose prey exceeds that of all other beasts (lines 10-11) and asks (line 15), "when he shall come, by whom she shall be put to flight." Thereupon Hugh Capet in savage irony gives assurance that the second infamous Charles of the three from his line, he of Valois, is *not* to be that valiant Hound — not only sneering at his nickname "Senzaterra," but also parodying perhaps the famous line of *Inf.*, I, 103: "Questi *non* ciberà *terra* nè peltro" with the words (*Purg.*, XX, 76-7): "Quindi *non terra,* ma peccato e onta / guadagnerà" — and concludes with an answering cry of anguished supplication (lines 94-5): "O my Lord, when shall I see thy vengeance (*vendetta*)?"

In *Purg.*, XXXIII, 35-6, Beatrice assures Dante that "the one who is to blame for the damage and dishonor suffered by the Sacred Vessel of the Church" — evidently meaning, first of all, that "loose harlot" of *Purg.*, XXXII, 149, the corrupt Papacy, or better, papal Corruption — "may believe that the vengeance (*vendetta*) of God fears no *suppe.*" And seven lines later she predicts that "515" (*or* "1515"), evidently one and the same with the Veltro, the Hound, of *Inf.*, I, who shall slay "*la fuia*" — the now *slinking* harlot — and the giant too. To this, especially to the *suppe,* we shall return presently.

Finally, in *Par.*, XXVII, 55-7, while all the heavenly company blush for shame, St. Peter arraigns the Church's degeneracy and worldliness with the words: "In shepherds' clothes rapacious wolves are seen from here throughout all the pastures; O defence of God, why dost thou yet (*or* 'merely') remain lying?"—for thus,

with the canny Buti, honor of early commentators, I interpret this; *i. e.*, 'why dost thou still delay to charge like a faithful and efficient shepherd dog, but liest yet inactive watching the ravaging wolves?'

In all the foregoing passages one single general concept shines forth: a valiant defender of the Truth and of Holiness shall discomfit and put to flight the Church's Corruptor; and more or less explicitly the poet's imagination seems to have been pervaded by the figure of a mighty and swift Hound, who shall utterly rout the preying wolves, the She Wolf of Avarice in particular and of all greeds and lusts in general, which defile and ravish the Church. For in Old Italian *lupa* (*vulg.* lova) meant not only "she wolf" but also "*harlot*";[1] and this is the Harlot of Papal Corruption, whose paramour was the Giant of Temporal Entanglements.

If it is incredible that Italian expositors should have overlooked this double significance of *lupa*, it is still more so that the English along with other foreign commentators have wrestled so long, and sometimes so ludicrously, with *suppe*, in *Purg.*, XXXIII, 36; its obvions bearing and meaning is that the Hound of Heaven's Vengeance is not to be cheated of his prey with *sops*, as was Cerberus by the Sibyl's *offa* in *Aeneid*, VI, 420, or by the handfuls of mud with which Dante saw Vergil quiet him in the third circle of hell — gluttonous guard of the gluttonous, and like them greedy for *earth* (*terra*) and the things of earth.[2] It was indeed a vile sop which sufficed to appease him: Dante had fully described its composition a few lines earlier (*Inf.*, VI, 10-12):

> Grandine grossa, acqua tinta e neve
> per l'aere tenebroso si riversa;
> pute la *terra* che questo riceve.

---

[1] This fact as to the secondary meaning of *lupa* lends much weight to the very satisfactory and appealing interpretation of the Three Beasts of *Inf.*, I, which makes them symbolize, respectively: the *lonza*, lust of the eye; the *lupa*, lust of the flesh; and the *leone*, pride of life. (I. John, 2, 16: "quoniam omne, quod est in mundo, concupiscentia carnis est, & concupiscentia oculorum, & superbia vitae: quae non est ex Patre, sed ex mundo est.")

[2] *Inf.*, VI, 25 ff. Cerberus forgets all else, as like a famished cur he gulps down the *terra;* while the avenger Hound of I, 101, will disdain to eat of "*terra* nè peltro."

Well might he refer to handfuls of it as "sops," and contemptuously aver that no such would ever be feared by God's Avenger.

The commentator Pietro, Dante's own son, explaining these *suppe* of *Purg.*, XXXIII, 36, equates *suppa* with the Latin *offa* (". . . offa, sive suppa . . ."), and can hardly have been more ignorant of the fact than was his father — who "knew all of Vergil" — that it was an *offa* with which the Sibyl quieted Cerberus. How then arose the dust of doubt that finally seems to have hidden the simple explanation of Dante's *suppe* from the eyes of commentators during the last half-millennium?

It seems to have been stirred up by the fact that the earliest among them, after alleging a Greek custom — on what basis I shall indicate later—in accordance with which vendetta might be averted if a murderer ate sops for a period upon his victim's grave,[3] went on, in that accommodating and facile vein so unhappily characteristic of commentators old, middle, and recent, to add that 'this was also the custom in Italy,' and even that Florentine families, in particular, were wont to provide against such evasions by keeping guard for nine days over the tombs of their murdered dear ones. Which assertion naturally found its skeptical critics,[4] and the controversy was on. Meanwhile the obvious equation: *suppa* = *offa* was forgotten.

I promised, a bit back, to justify the earliest commentators in their predication of a Greek origin for this custom. Accepting as undisputed the equivalence of the "honey-cake" (*offa*) of *Aeneid*, VI, 420, with the Greek μελιτόεσσα (*sc.* μάζα), Attic μελιτοῦττα,[5] the whole matter becomes reasonably clear when we read, for example, in Suidas' *Lexicon*, *s. v.* μελιτοῦττα: . . . Ἰστέον ὅτι ἡ μελιτοῦττα ἐδίδοτο τοῖς νεκροῖς, ὡς εἰς τὸν Κέρβερον, "Be it known that honey-cake was given to the dead, as [of use with regard] to

[3] *E. g.*, Lana: "Qui il Poeta intromette un' usanza, ch' era anticamente nelle parti di Grecia, che se uno uccidea un altro, ed egli poteva andare nove dì continui a mangiare una suppa suso la sepoltura del defuncto nel comune, i parenti del morto non faceano più nessuna vendetta."

[4] Buti, not unexpectedly, among the first.

[5] Authoritative, for example, is E. Norden, *Aeneis, Buch VI, erklärt von*, Leipzig, 1903 (Teubner), p. 237, note to VI, 420: "Besonders kühn ist, wie er 420 die μελιτοῦττα wiedergibt: *melle soporatam et medicatis frugibus offam.*"

Cerberus"—that is, freely, "to use on Cerberus";[6] the method and purpose of its use was too familiar to require further explanation. Dante's early commentators somehow knew of this Greek custom and of the related method of avoiding vendetta—whether Dante himself did or did not is immaterial to his own poem and to its exegesis—and it may well have been not entirely, or not at all, through the literary traditions that they knew of it; the first Charles (d'Anjou) is said by the False Boccaccio to have brought it from France[7] and to have used it at the slaughter of Conradin and his nobles in Naples; but it is likelier on the face of it that the custom was Neapolitan—or more probably, known to all the ancient Greek domain.

I have not yet pursued the subject through all its bypaths; but I feel satisfied that Dante's *suppe* of *Purg.*, XXXIII, 36, is simply the equivalent of our familiar English "*sop* to Cerberus"—plural perhaps not only for the rime and to give general or "repeated" sense, but also because of Cerberus' three mouths—and that if the commentators had been more honest as to the prevalence of the sop-eating custom in Florentine territory, the attention of later students would not have been so long diverted from the correct interpretation.

HERBERT D. AUSTIN.

University of Southern California.

[6] The rest of the outfitting of the dead for their trans-Stygian journey is thus itemized in the concluding phrases of this passage: *καὶ ὀβολὸς μισθὸς τῷ πορθμεῖ· καὶ στέφανος, ὡς τὸν βίον διηγωνισμένοις* (Suidae *Lexicon* Graece et Latine . . . post Thomam Gaisfordum recensuit et annotatione critica instruxit Godofredus Bernhardy. Halis et Brunsvigae 1853. 2 vols., Vol. II, cols. 769-770. The Latin translation there given of our passage is: "Sciendum est, placentam mellitam mortuis dari solitam ad placandum Cerberum; et obolum, naulum portitori; et coronam, ut vitae certamine defunctis."

[7] At least, his slovenly Italian seems to mean that: ". . . questa usanza arrecò Carlo senza terra di Francia, che quando egli sconfisse e prese Curradino con gli altri baroni de la Magna e fece loro tagliare la testa in Napoli, e poi dice che feciono fare le suppe e mangiaronle sopra quei corpi morti, cioè Carlo con gli altri suoi baroni, dicendo che mai non se ne farebbe vendetta." The "senza terra" in the above is an evident mistake.

ON THE CHRONOLOGY OF THOMAS KYD'S PLAYS.

Was Thomas Kyd's dramatic work contemporary with or precedent to that of Marlowe, Greene, and Shakespeare? Upon the answer to this question will hinge some fairly important points in Elizabethan dramatic history. The question has been complicated by the fact that Kyd ceased dramatic activity some time before his death. It has been further complicated, I believe, by a misreading of Kyd's own statement upon the matter. In a letter to Sir John Puckering,[1] Kyd is rather contemptuous of mere playwrights in general, and Marlowe in particular, leading us to infer that he gave up such low pursuits as writing plays when he entered the service of his Lord, from which he had but recently been ejected.[2] Thus the beginning of this service determines the end of Kyd's dramatic career.

Boas reads Kyd's statement of the length of service as "almost theis iij yeres nowe";[3] but I must read "vj yeres nowe." A powerful binocular will make it evident at a glance that we have here a slightly blotted v followed by a j, the regular Elizabethan form of terminal i; but the same thing is on careful examination apparent to the naked eye.[4] Since the last figure is clearly a j, the question is whether we are to read the first part as "v" or "ii." The initial stroke of Kyd's v differs from his i in four respects. It begins far below the line instead of on or above, has greater height above the line, is undotted, and has a left-hand spur at the end, preparatory to the concluding curve. The initial stroke here clearly has all four of these characteristics. The second element

[1] Boas, *Kyd*, facsimile, cviii-cx.

[2] Boas, *Kyd*, xxiv-xxv.

[3] An examination of the facsimile will show that in order to read Kyd's statement as "iij" we must suppose that he had dotted only the final j, whereas he is very careful to dot his i's; that he has made the second i almost without height and with rounded outlines; that he has connected the j almost with the top of the second i instead of with the bottom; that he has made the first i unduly high; that he has begun it below instead of above the line; and that he has made irregularly a left-hand spur at the conclusion of the first i.

[4] I owe thanks to Professor Robert K. Root of Princeton for suggestions on the presentation of this technical point.

is also more easily interpreted as the conclusion of a v than as a second i. It is to be noticed that in forming his v Kyd makes a slight spur to the left at the bottom of this initial minim as a change of direction for his pen when he starts the curve around and back to the shaft, which completes the letter. This spur is distinctly visible here but cannot regularly be accounted for if the second element is interpreted as being i. The curve is only slightly irregular for the ending of v. Its general outline is correct, the chief difficulty being that the curve returns to the shaft somewhat lower than is ordinary. But since under any interpretation the pen has blotted slightly here, and rather frequently for several lines, we need only suppose that this was the cause of the slight deviation in direction. I take it then that Kyd wrote "vj" and not "iij."

The context itself implies that "iij" is incorrect, since Kyd speaks of two years as only a short time but speaks of this term as a long time. Further, six years fits exactly into our other facts. Since Kyd wrote this letter about the autumn of 1593,[5] "almost theis vj yeres nowe" would carry us back to the latter part of 1587. Now Boas[6] has already shown that Kyd had turned at least temporarily to a different kind of work by 1588, in which year appeared *The Householders Philosophie.* Since this work was entered S. R. February 6, 1588,[7] the actual work of translation was doubtless done in or before 1587. It is probably significant then that we have but one known piece of work from Kyd's pen between this translation of 1588 and that of *Cornelia* in 1594, after Kyd had lost his place. In the interim, he did not need to support himself by hackwork of any kind.

Too, Kyd's own statement of the time and circumstances of his meeting Marlowe is significant. Kyd says his acquaintance with Marlowe "rose vpon his bearing name to serve my Lo: although his L^{p} never knewe his service, but in writing for his plaiers."[8] The occasion and approximate time of this meeting was "o^{r} wrytinge in one chamber twoe yeares synce" from the autumn of 1593, which presumably would be in 1591. But this association did not last long. Says Kyd, "aswell by my lords

[5] Boas, *Kyd*, lxxiii ff.

[6] Boas, *Kyd*, lxii.

[7] Arber, *Transcript*, II, 484.

[8] Boas, *Kyd*, cviii-cix.

commanndmt as in hatred of his life & thoughts I left & did refraine his companie." [9] He also intimates that he had not long continued the association, and refers to "when I sawe him last." Thus the acquaintance of Kyd with Marlowe began about 1591, and their close association probably did not outlast the year, certainly was of short duration.

Had Kyd been in close touch with dramatic work, it is impossible that he should not have met Marlowe in 1587 or shortly after. This conclusion is made even stronger by the fact that both men pretty certainly wrote for the same organization.[10] But, if so, Kyd's work must have been done before Marlowe began writing for the company the autumn 1587, since otherwise, under the conditions of the times, Kyd would certainly have met Marlowe then. I take it therefore that by the autumn of 1587, at the age of twenty-nine, Kyd ceased writing for the stage to enter the household of "my Lo." [11] This means that as a dramatist he was unquestionably the predecessor of Marlowe, Greene, and Shakespeare.

This account of things also frees Kyd from some of the insinuations and worse that overzealous defenders of Marlowe have thrown out against him. It seems clear that Kyd's contact with Marlowe was but accidental, of short duration, and of no intimacy. It is to be hoped that any one of us who may have found it expedient to share lodgings with another for some weeks or even months in hotel or rooming house is not to be held responsible for the deeds and opinions of that person, and may even criticise them vigorously should occasion arise. Of course, we may admire Marlowe's strenuous attempt to think for himself on religious problems, even if he did severely shock the decided majority of religious thinkers in his day. But the very fact that they were so shocked gives Kyd his sufficient excuse likewise to voice his disapproval. Certainly, here is no double-dyed villain, betraying a life-long friend.

The fact that Kyd ceased writing for the stage in or before 1587 enables us to date his plays a little more closely. The only sur-

[9] Brown, *Lond. Times, L. S.*, June 2, 1921.

[10] This I have demonstrated in detail in work as yet unpublished.

[11] I shall show elsewhere that "my Lo" was pretty certainly Pembroke.

viving play, known on external evidence to be his, is *The Spanish Tragedy,* dated on Jonson's statement 1584-9, which would be narrowed by our evidence above to 1584-7. Quite likely Kyd wrote a first part to this play, presumably beforehand; but Boas is certainly correct, I think, in rejecting the surviving *First Part of Jeronimo* as this play. He seems also correct in his attribution of *Soliman and Perseda* to Kyd. The play was entered S. R. November 22, 1592. If it belongs to Kyd, it should date before the autumn of 1587. It has been pointed out that the play antedates the Armada, since the Spanish knight and Spanish bravery are praised. Now the complimentary reference to Queen Elizabeth at the end of the play shows that this is a court version. Certainly no man in his right mind would have attempted to subject the Queen's ears to such praise of Spain after the open hostilities of 1588. Since the Spaniard had been preparing against England as early as 1585, and had been confidently expected to launch his blow in 1587,[12] this very favorable reference hardly is so late as 1587 and probably is considerably earlier.

Death's curious compliment to Queen Elizabeth must belong to those grim years 1584-6. Says Death:

> I [aye], now will *Death,* in his most haughtie pride,
> Fetch his imperiall Carre from deepest hell,
> And ride in triumph through the wicked world;
> Sparing none but sacred *Cynthias* friend,
> Whom *Death* did feare before her life began:
> For holy fates haue grauen it in their tables
> That *Death* shall die, if he attempt her end,
> Whose life is heauens delight, and *Cynthias* friend.

In his statement that the fated law is "*Death* shall die, if he attempt her end" there is a direct allusion to current events. In October 1584, following the murder of the Prince of Orange in July, an association was formed in England under pledge to exterminate all who should attempt to harm the Queen or procure her death, the object being to protect her from Queen Mary's plotters.[13] Shortly after, Parliament met; and following long discussion as to the best procedure, finally passed an act in March 1585 embodying the features of the pledge. Here is the fated

[12] Lodge, *Illustrations,* II, 275, 302-3, 341, 353, etc.; *D. N. B.,* Elizabeth.
[13] *D. N. B.,* Elizabeth.

law. In the midst of the debate, came the trial and condemnation of Parry Feb. 25, 1585 on the charge of attempting to compass the death of the Queen, this being the event that incited Parliament to final action.[14] On April 20, it was considered wise to put Queen Mary under close guard, which was made yet closer early in 1586. The Babington conspirators were tried and condemned September 13, and Queen Mary brought to trial October 14 and 15, 1586, all on the charge of trying to compass Queen Elizabeth's death. Too, at least one T. K., probably Kyd himself, had contributed in 1586 to "Verses of Praise and Joy" over Elizabeth's escape from the Babington conspiracy.[15] Clearly Death refers to these strenuous measures of this strenuous period to guard Queen Elizabeth from death, and thus is speaking not earlier than the court season 1584-5. It seems clear too that the reference could have been conceived and received as a compliment only in the first full flush of enthusiasm, while it might be proffered as the pledge of the actors along with those of other loyal subjects.[16] For one did not lightly remind the Virgin Queen of age and death, and only on such an occasion might she be expected to consider the reminder as a compliment. Since the death of Mary relieved the tension, this allusion seems certainly to date 1584-6. Our information on plays at court the season 1584-5 is sufficiently definite to make it certain that *Soliman* was not among them.[17] Besides, the law referred to was not passed till March 1585. Elizabeth's acting or earnest over the sentence and final execution of Mary would pretty certainly rule out the court season 1586-7 as a decidedly inopportune time for this allusion. We thus have the court season 1585-6 left as the most fitting, and seemingly only possible, time for the allusion. Now if the play was Kyd's, it probably belonged to the Admiral's company, whose last recorded appearances at court before the Armada were Dec. 27, 1585 and January 6, 1586,[18] exactly where our allusion seems to fit. Presumably this is the company's first play at court after passage of the law, and hence the one of December 27, 1585.

[14] D'Ewes, *Journals*, 355.

[15] Boas, *Kyd*, xxv-xxvi, 340-1.

[16] One should read Froude's account of these events to get some idea of how profoundly Englishmen were stirred; or Spedding, *Bacon*, I, 14-16, 25 ff.

[17] Chambers, *Eliz. Stage*, IV, 100-101.

[18] Chambers, *op. cit.*, IV, 101-2.

Still another point possibly indicates this same dating. If the play was the Admiral's, Alleyn's part in the play would, I think, have been Erastus, who is "not twentie yeares of age,"[19] whereas in the source he is but about sixteen. Now Alleyn was born September 1566 and would have been twenty in September 1586. It is likely then that the age of Erastus is really the age of the performer, Alleyn, as was regularly the case, for instance, in the Shakespearean company. If so, the play dates before September 1586 and possibly after September 1585. It seems certain then that *Soliman and Perseda* dates 1585-6, almost certainly the autumn 1585.

Further, *The Spanish Tragedy* certainly precedes *Soliman and Perseda,* whether Kyd wrote the latter or not. Boas has given strong reasons for this relation, and has furnished materials in the parallels between the plays for conclusive proof. He finds,[20] as I count, nine changes and additions in *Soliman and Perseda* not found in the source but paralleling *The Spanish Tragedy.* Since these parallels are too close and too numerous to be merely accidental, we must suppose that one play has consciously paralleled the other. This granted, one must conclude that *Soliman and Perseda* succeeds *The Spanish Tragedy* since it varies from its source for the purpose of introducing parallels to *The Spanish Tragedy,* many of them extraneous and almost purposeless—as for instance the brother-killing scene—whereas their analogues in *The Spanish Tragedy* were vital to the story. If *Soliman and Perseda* dates the autumn 1585, then *The Spanish Tragedy* would date not later than the summer 1585. Since *Soliman* cannot date later than the autumn 1586, *The Spanish Tragedy* cannot date later than the summer 1586. Boas[21] shows that the latter play certainly is not earlier than 1582 and gives some faint indications for 1585 as the upper limit. The date of *The Spanish Tragedy* would thus certainly be 1582-6, almost certainly 1582-5, and *The First Part of Jeronimo* would precede. If Boas' suggested allusions for 1585 could be trusted, we could pretty certainly date the play the summer 1585. But I feel on grounds of literary style that *The Spanish Tragedy* is considerably earlier than *Soliman,* and should thus be disposed to place it near 1582,

[19] III, 1, 18. [20] Boas, *Kyd,* lvii-lix. [21] Boas, *Kyd,* xxix.

taking the reference to the "late conflict" between Spain and Portugal as an allusion to the final one of 1580,[22] in which England was so much interested that she long supported the Portuguese pretender, Don Antonio, as a threat against Spain.[23]

Besides these plays, various others have been attributed to Kyd, the *Ur-Hamlet* probably most persistently, chiefly on the strength of Nash's well-known gibe at the play in the summer 1589. But even if Nash should be pointing at Kyd in the same connection, he is mentioning him as only one of "a sort of shifting companions," so that *Hamlet* may have been written by anyone else of "these men." Besides, Nash says "these men" have turned from Senecan plays to Italian translations, so that he is not necessarily referring to Kyd as an active playwright. Now the *Ur-Hamlet,* I think, we can date for this summer 1589, its newness being the occasion of Nash's attention, though the indications for this dating I reserve for discussion in another connection. If the play does so date, then Kyd must almost certainly be freed from responsibility for it.

Of course, much of our evidence concerning Kyd's work is not even yet so definite as we could wish. Still we are now certain of one important point, and that is that Kyd had ceased writing for the stage when Marlowe, Greene, and Shakespeare began. This should mean among other things that the honor of popularizing blank verse is to be passed, at least partially, to Kyd, though our evidence is too scant to give any assurance that even Kyd was the first to popularize this form. Too much of the evidence has been lost, or obscured by the Elizabethan habit of revision for us to say or imply that blank verse sprang suddenly into favor on the popular stage. More probably it had been slowly and steadily gaining, till now in the hands of such men as Kyd and Marlowe it supplanted all other forms. But under any interpretation Marlowe must at least share honors with Kyd. As with blank verse, so with other dramatic contributions. The pioneer predecessor of these other men on the popular stage, Kyd merits greater credit than he has ordinarily received. His was a very important contribution to the development of Elizabethan drama.

Goucher College. T. W. BALDWIN.

[22] Boas, *Kyd,* xxx-xxxi.

[23] Hume, *Burghley,* Index, Antonio.

COLLE'S BORROWING FROM THE SULLY MEMOIRS

La Partie de Chasse de Henri IV, a play written in eulogy of the most idolized of French kings, contributed in a large measure to the vulgarization of the Henri IV legend in France. It is but one of many dramatizations of the universally popular theme of the king and his subject.[1] The author, Charles Collé (1709-1783), noted in his preface that he had borrowed very freely from Robert Dodsley's *The King and the Miller of Mansfield.*[2] He furthermore stated that he drew on the Sully memoirs for historical documentation of the first act of the play.[3]

It has never been definitely pointed out how and to what extent the Sully memoirs served Collé. Several critics have noted the attribution without, however, indicating the scope of such influences or mentioning the passages in question.[4] Obviously a mere reference to an eight volume set of memoirs constitutes but a feeble indication of source.[5]

The first act of the play is a dramatic reconciliation scene between the king and his minister whose position is threatened by political enemies and jealous courtiers. The historical events which formed the background of Collé's scene are recorded by Sully in the year 1605, and the threatened rupture between Henri and Sully is reported in the *Oeconomies Royales* (VI, 150-165). The date of these events can be fixed as the last week of May, 1605, inasmuch as the account is preceded by a letter dated May 26 and followed by another bearing the date May 29, of this year.

[1] Other well known versions are *Le Roi et le Fermier* by Sedaine, and *Il Re Alla Caccia* by Goldoni, both in 1763.

[2] "Je ne dois pas laisser ignorer que j'ai pris le fond de ma pièce dans une comédie anglaise dont la traduction est imprimée." Collé, Avertissement à *La Partie de Chasse de Henri IV.*

[3] "L'on verra aussi que les *Mémoires* de Sully ne m'ont pas été inutiles." *Ibid.*

[4] Lenient states only that Collé composed his play on "des souvenirs historiques empruntés en grande partie aux *Mémoires* de Sully." *La Comédie Au XVIIIe Siècle,* II, 156.

[5] Petitot, *Collection des Mémoires Relatifs a L'Histoire de France, Seconde Serie, Oeconomies Royales,* Paris, 1820.

The textual similitudes as well as the narrative threads of the play and its memoir sources are in many cases striking and reveal Collé as a student of the historical documents of his country. The following passages indicate what use he made of the Sully documents.

	Collé [6]	Sully [7]
1.	Sully: Avant son depart, votre Majesté n'aurait-elle point encore quelques ordres à me donner?	Sully: Sire, vous plaist-il me commander quelque chose?
2.	Henri: Mais n'auriez-vous rien à me dire qui vous regardât, vous, Monsieur?	Henri: Venez-ça, n'avez vous rien du tout à me dire?
3.	Henri: Vous, mon cher Bellegarde, suivez-moi; j'ai un mot à vous dire sur votre gouvernement de Bourgogne.	Henri: M. le grand, allons nous promener, car je veux parler à vous, afin que vous partiez des aujourd'huy pour vous en aller en Bourgongne.
4.	Henri: prenant M. de Sully par la main: Eh bien Monsieur, la façon dont nous sommes ensemble, depuis six semaines; le froid que je vous marque, et la contrainte dans laquelle nous vivons vis à-vis l'un de l'autre. . . .	Henri: Mon amy, je ne saurais plus souffrir, des experiences et cognoissances de vingt-trois ans nous ayant suffisamment tesmoigné l'affection et sincerité l'un de l'autre, les froideurs, retenuës et dissimulations dont nous avons usé depuis un mois. . . .
5.	Sully: Quant aux satyres; et surtout, Sire au libelle fait par Juvigny. . . . [8]	Henri: Les divers avis et memoires . . . comme celuy que Juvigny me bailla. . . .
6.	Sully: Quel seroit mon but dans une trahison prise dans le grand? De me mettre votre couronne sur la tête? De la faire passer à quelqu' autre branche de votre Maison, ou à quelque Puissance etrangère!	Sully: Car quels buts pourroy-je avoir, Sire, sinon deux seulement, à sçavoir; l'un de me vouloir approprier la couronne de France, et l'autre de la transferer de vous à autry?

[6] *La Partie de Chasse de Henri IV*, act I, Scenes 4-8 passim.

[7] *Oeconomies Royales*, VI, 150 ff.

[8] The title of this libel was: Discours d'Etat pour faire voir au Roi en quoi Sa Majesté est mal servie. See Dussieux, *Lettres Intimes de Henry IV*, 406, Paris, 1876.

7. Sully: Ah, Sire, permettez qu'avec les larmes de la joie je me précipite à vos pieds pour vous remercier.	Sully: Et me permettez que je me jette a vos pieds et vous embrasse les genoux.
8., Henri: Relèvez-vous donc; prenez donc garde; ces gens là qui nous voient, mais qui n'ont pas pu entendre ce que nous disons, vont croire que je vous pardonne.	Henri: Non, ne le faites pas, car je ne voudrois pour rien du monde que ceux qui nous regardent creussent que vous eussiez commis aucune faute qui meritast une telle soumission.
9. Henri: Je suis bien aise, Messieurs, de vous déclarer à tous, que j'aime Rosny plus que jamais; et qu'entre lui et moi, c'est á la vie et à la mort.	Henri: Je veux bien dire à tous que j'ayme Rosny plus que jamais, et qu'entre luy et moy, c'est à la mort et à la vie.

OLAV K. LUNDEBERG.

University of Minnesota.

BEOWULF 159-163

Grendel, a fiend of hell (*Beow.* 101; cf. 120, 592), is by that token, a spirit of darkness (83, 703), inhabiting or commonly traversing murky and sombre regions (*mist*hleoþum, 710; *dȳgel* lond, 1357; næssa *genipu,* 1360; *myrcan* mōr, 1405), of which some, at least, are high as well as dark (mist*hleoþum,* 710; *næssa* genipu, 1360; *stēap* stān*hliðo,* 1409). Among the regions thus inhabited are those designated by the word *mōr* (sē þe *mōras* hēold, 103; ðā cōm of *mōre* under misthleoþum, 710; micle mearcstapan *mōras* healdan, 1340; ofer myrcan *mōr,* 1405). Of the passages which associate the notion of gloom with that of *mōr,* the following (159-163) calls for particular attention to the italicized words:

> [Ac se] āglǣca ēhtende wæs,
> *deorc dēaþscua,* duguþe ond geogoþe,
> seomade ond syrede; sinnihte hēold
> *mistige mōras;* men ne cunnon
> hwyder helrūnan hwyrftum scrīþað.[1]

---

[1] Thus translated by Clark Hall: "But the demon, the dark death-shadow, kept pursuing young and old; caught and entrapped them. Night

In this passage, what sense shall we attribute to *mistige mōras?* To the five occurrences of *mōr* in *Beowulf,* Grein (*Sprachschatz*) assigns the meanings *uligo, palus, stagnum.* The only other instance which he places under this head is *Dan.* 575. The remaining occurrences of the word, six in number, he defines as *mons, saltus. Dan.* 573-5 reads thus (Nebuchadnezzar is addressed):

> ac þū lifgende lange þrāge
> heorta hlȳþum geond holt wunast;
> ne bið þec mǣlmete nymðe mōres græs.[2]

In this case, *mōr* seems to mean *mountain* rather than *swamp,* because (1) of its association with the *holt* of the preceding line, somewhat as the *mōr* of *Beow.* 1405 is with the "steep, rocky slopes" of 1409 and the "mountain-trees" of 1414; (2) of the fact that the leaps of the deer seem to belong to firm rather than to marshy ground; (3) of the consideration that, as Nebuchadnezzar was "to eat grass as oxen" (Dan. 4. 25), it was rather more likely that he should pasture on upland (cf. Ps. 50. 10) than on quagmires.

Returning to *Beowulf* from this excursion, we may perhaps find a clue to the italicized words in the above lines by turning to Jer. 13. 16:

> Date Domino Deo vestro gloriam antequam contenebrescat, et antequam offendant pedes vestri ad *montes caliginosos;* expectabitis lucem, et ponet eam in *umbram mortis* et in caliginem.[3]

after night he held the misty moors—men know not where such sorcerers go [glide about?] in their wanderings."

And thus by Grein (*Dichtungen der Angelsachsen*, 1857):

> Der Unhold verfolgte unaufhörlich,
> der unheimliche Todschatten, Alt und Jung.
> Er lag Unheil brütend, bewohnte in ewiger Nacht
> die Nebelmoore; nicht wissen Menschen
> wohin sich wenden die Höllenzauberer.

[2] Thus translated by Grein:

> sondern lebend sollst du lange Zeit
> im Holze wohnen mit der Hirsche Sprüngen;
> keine Mundkost wirst du ausser Moorwaldes Gras
> . . . finden.

[3] The A. V. translates: "Give glory to the Lord your God before he cause darkness, and before your feet stumble upon the *dark mountains,* and, while ye look for light, he turn it into the *shadow of death*, and make it gross darkness."

That *mistige mōras* may well translate *montes caliginosos* is sufficiently established by the rendering of Isa. 13. 2 at the foot of page 18 of the *Durham Ritual* (ed. Stevenson), where *montem calig[in]osum* is glossed as *mōr mistig*—the noun and the adjective being nowhere else combined in the Vulgate. As for the translation of *mons* by *mōr*, I cite corresponding passages of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History:*

Plummer 1. 267. 1: angustias inaccessorum montium
Miller 358. 4: nearo fæsten micel ungefēredra mōra
Plummer 1. 270. 5-6: in arduis asperisque montibus
Miller 364. 4-5: in hēaum mōrum ond in rēðum

Compare also, from the Bible:

Ps. 74. (75.) 6: a desertis montibus
of þissum wēstum wīdum mōrum

It is noteworthy that in the Lindisfarne Gospels (see my *Glossary*), *mons,* with two exceptions only, is translated by *mōr.* Everything considered, then, the equation of *mōr* and *mons* would appear to have prevailed in Northumbria.

As to *dēaþscua* = *umbra mortis,* we may note that the normal sense of the Hebrew original (see Brown, Driver, and Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon,* p. 853) is deep shadow, darkness. In Jer. 13. 16, this is figuratively applied to distress, as also in Ps. 107. 10, 14; Isa. 9. 1. The New Testament instances are Matt. 4. 16; Lk. 1. 79 (from Isa. 9. 1), where *shadow of death* means thick darkness, and, figuratively, the darkness of ignorance and sin. In Old English poetry there is a tendency, as here, to personalize the shadow of death. In my edition of *Christ,* I emended the *dēor dǣdscua* of 257 to *deorc dēaðscua,* and commented on it as follows: "It is the personified Shadow of Death, a sublime conception. Imagine Milton's description of Death, *P. L.* 2. 666-673, applied to Satan." Perhaps the destruction of Grendel may thus symbolize the overthrow of Satan and his power of darkness (see Klaeber's edition, p. li).

Albert Stanburrough Cook.

Yale University.

REVIEWS

The Elizabethan Stage. By E. K. CHAMBERS. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1924. Four volumes.

In *The Nation* of August 27, 1924 the present reviewer published a brief notice of Mr. Chambers's admirable, important, and most useful work on the Elizabethan Stage. No apology is needed for recurring here to the same subject; indeed an absolutely adequate review could not be prepared without many months of preliminary investigation, for it would necessitate the checking over of multitudinous references and the testing of many hypotheses and inferences. Students in our various seminaries in English literature will gradually accomplish this work as they continue to make constant use of an indispensable book. Meanwhile a brief report upon the scope, method, and limitations of Mr. Chambers's work is in order.

The author's reputation is in itself a guarantee of patient exhaustive effort and substantial accuracy. He has unearthed but few new documents or new "facts"; but he has gathered together from many sources and in convenient orderly form a vast amount of material needed for the proper understanding of the social and economic conditions in which the Elizabethan theatres flourished, of the status of the actors and authors, of the relation of author and theatre-manager and of these two to the book-seller, of the connection of the drama with the court, of the attempts at government regulation of the stage, and of many similar subjects. His text is subjected to the control of a long series of appendices in which the appropriate contemporary documents are collected together. He has compiled a very full Calendar of all plays, masks, and quasi-dramatic entertainments at court during the period from the accession of Elizabeth to the death of Shakespeare. His lists of dramatists, actors, theatres, and separate plays form a veritable encyclopaedia of reference which will not be superseded for a very long time, if ever. He has approached the much-debated subject of the structure of the Elizabethan stage from a new "angle."

Mr. Chambers begins his work with an account of those aspects of court-life in the reign of Elizabeth and the earlier years of James I which have a bearing upon the history of the stage. The

justification for selecting this point of departure rests not only in the fact that these two monarchs and their courts were patrons of prime importance but that very many of the documents from which the stage-history can be reconstructed are court records. Unavoidably, however, the plan elected tends to give undue emphasis to the courtly side of dramatic entertainment at the expense of the popular side. This is a serious drawback, for the Elizabethan drama, for all the interest in it taken by the court, is essentially a popular form of art, closely connected with the life, the interests, and the ideas of the common people. Mr. Chambers, relying too cautiously upon the clearest and most authoritative records, fails to make this manifest.

The account of the royal household leads naturally to a similar study of the office of the revels, supplemented in appendices by the records of payments for entertainments and by the aforesaid Calendar. Thence Mr. Chambers passes to the subject of pageantry and the mask; and then, with no very logical connection, to "Humanism and Puritanism," an excellent summary of the several phases of the struggle which led in 1642 to the closing of the theatres. The disadvantages inherent in the author's self-imposed limitations as to date are especially apparent in this section of his work, for the story of the Puritan attack upon the stage breaks off long before its climax. The subject leads naturally to a narrative of the government's attempt to control the theatres and to exercise a censorship. Clear and orderly as this account is, it adds little to what Professor Thorndike and Dean Gildersleeve have already published upon the subject. The appendix (D) which accompanies this chapter is, however, enormously useful, for it is a summary with long *verbatim* extracts, of the "Documents of Control."

For all his meticulous dependence upon records Mr. Chambers finds pleasure (as readers of his classical work on *The Mediaeval Stage* will recall) in the humane and picturesque aspects of his delightful theme. The almost overwhelming abundance of his material here obliges him to lay a severe rein upon this inclination; but in the chapter on "The Actor's Quality" (*i. e.* upon the social and financial status of the professional actor) it is obvious that with larger space Mr. Chambers would willingly have treated the personal and picturesque sides of the subject at greater length. With this fine chapter his first volume closes.

The second volume deals with the theatres and theatrical companies, the history of each being epitomized in turn; and it contains also a list of actors alphabetically arranged with all the available biographical data and records of their connection with the several companies of players. A portion of volume III and a small part of volume IV contain lists of plays, arranged under the author's name where the author is known or else grouped together as anonymous; in these lists the facts with regard to the stage history and the publication of each play are assembled. Problems of sources, technique, motives and the like lie beyond Mr. Chambers's scope. The remainder of the final volume is occupied with the appendices. I return to volume III to note that it is concerned largely with the problem of the Elizabethan stage. Mr. Chambers's distinctive contribution to this much-debated question is his adherence to the "historical method" of inquiry, with a consequent abandonment of the traditional manner of dealing with the subject, namely, by the attempted reconstruction of a "typical" Elizabethan stage. He holds it unwise to start with the assumption that any such "typical" stage is conceivable in an investigation "which covers the practices of thirty or forty playing companies, in a score of theatres, over a period of not much less than a century." In view of the constant shifting of companies and plays from one theatre to another he is ready to admit that some "standardization of effects" (in Mr. Archer's phrase) probably took place; but similar "effects" might well have been produced by very dissimilar arrangements. He urges the probability that "a considerable evolution in the capacities of stage management" took place between the beginning and the close of the period with which he deals. And he begins his inquiry with an examination of court performances. This theme at once leads him to study the Italian influence upon the structure of the English stage, and he stresses the importance of Serlio's *Trattato sopra le Scene,* of which long extracts with illustrations are provided in Appendix G. In his chapters on the popular theatres Mr. Chambers makes a not altogether clear division at the turn of the century. Indisputably there are new characteristics that appear about the time of the accession of James I, but the distinctions from the characteristics of the fifteen-nineties are not very well defined. Mr. Chambers rightly uses the De Witt drawing as the prime, and only strictly contemporary,

authority upon which to base any discussion. He recognizes the entirely secondary importance of the late title-pages upon which are engraved minute representations of the interior of theatres. Mr. Chambers's chapters are bound to stimulate new study and discussion of this archaeological problem; in fact the late Mr. William Archer (in *The Quarterly Review,* No. 479, April 1924, pp. 399 f.) has already essayed a rejoinder.

Criticism of the arbitrary terminus adopted by Mr. Chambers, beyond which he has not carried his researches, is in a measure forestalled by the author's prefatory expression of regret for the "long since irretrievable" decision not to carry his investigations beyond the date of Shakespeare's death. His book therefore ends abruptly at the fortuitous date, April 23, 1616, thus leaving many of the collections of data incomplete and quite as disconcertingly printing the earliest items of many other collections the main body of which date from a later period. How inconvenient this is may be seen by consulting the lists of dramatists, *sub, e. g.,* Beaumont, Fletcher, or Massinger.

Mr. Chambers nearly always distinguishes between recorded fact and inferences and hypotheses drawn from these facts. The warning must, however, be given that occasionally he fails to indicate this distinction, and in various parts of his work the reader must proceed with caution. This is especially the case when the subject is so delicate and complicated as, for example, the problem of the merging of one dramatic company into another; the identification of lost plays or plays perhaps still in existence but known under another name than that which they bear in old records; and the connection of the individual dramatists with the different companies. Repeated tests have given me a high degree of confidence in Mr. Chambers's general accuracy; but his book is not so impeccable as some reviewers have rashly declared. A number of important articles and monographs are not recorded. Thus, F. W. Moorman's chapter in *The Cambridge History of English Literature* (v, x) on the plays attributed to Shakespeare should have been included in the list in volume III, p. 203. There is no mention of important dissertations by Herbst and Sinning dealing with *Cupid's Revenge* (III, 225); nor those by Reinmold and Ebert on the *Four Plays in One* (III, 231). Professor E. E. Stoll's treatise on *Hamlet* (*Publications of the University of Minnesota,* VIII, No. 5)

is not listed among the authorities on the "Ur-Hamlet" (III, 397). Other articles by Dr. Stoll are also omitted. Knowledge of Professor Hillebrand's article on "The Children of the King's Revels at Whitefriars" (*Journal of English and Germanic Philology,* April, 1922) would have enabled Mr. Chambers to supplement his account of this company (II, 64 f.). The Pearson edition of *Edward the Fourth* is not recorded (IV, 10). *The True Tragedy of Richard the Third* is reprinted in the Furness *Variorum* (IV, 43). There are some positive misstatements. Mr. Chambers says (III, 216) that "in 1647 and 1679 the actors and publishers issued collections of fifty-three pieces" (by Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger). But the First Folio (1647) contained only those plays that had not previously appeared in quarto; and the Second Folio (1679) contains fifty-two, not fifty-three, pieces. *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* is probably not an "independent" Beaumont play (III, 217); it is generally believed that the Jasper-Luce scenes contain matter by Fletcher. *The Faithful Friends* should of course not be listed under Lost Plays (IV, 400). *The Second Maiden's Tragedy* is listed as lost with the curious contradictory note that it is "extant in MS" (IV, 402). As a matter of fact it was first printed in *The Old English Drama* (1825; volume I), and is reprinted in Hazlitt's *Dodsley,* volume X. Nor should *The Marriage of Wit and Wisdom* be set down as lost (IV, 402). Four, not three, plays (IV, 404) in the Egerton MS. 1994 date before 1616. Mr. Chambers has omitted (IV, 405) from his list of plays extant in MS. *Edmund Ironsides,* which is one of the pieces in Egerton 1994. He includes in this list of Manuscript Plays another in the same collection which he calls *I Richard II* (IV, 405). Eleven copies of this tedious piece were printed long ago by Halliwell-Phillipps. In the MS. it bears no title. It may be added that since Mr. Chambers's work was put into type the manuscript of *John a Kent and John a Cumber* (IV, 405), which he records as in the collection of Lord Mostyn, has changed hands. See Quaritch's Sale Catalogue, No. 380 (December 1923), item 135.

SAMUEL C. CHEW.

Bryn Mawr College.

Märchen des Mittelalters von ALBERT WESSELSKI. Berlin: Herbert Stubenrauch, 1925. xxiii, 271 pp.

In 1909 Wesselski published at Leipzig a handsome volume with the somewhat misleading title of *Mönchslatein, Erzählungen aus geistlichen Schriften des XIII. Jahrhunderts.* In it the author gave a German translation of one hundred and fifty-four *exempla,* from various sources. The principal stress was laid upon anecdotes and jests, and the extensive notes dealt largely with the diffusion of this class of literature.

In the new work, beautifully printed by Herbert Stubenrauch, the author presents to the public a new collection of sixty-six stories from the following sources: Bromyard (No. 41), Caesarius of Heisterbach (No. 33), Thomas Cantipratanus (No. 55), *Compilatio singularis exemplorum,* ed. Hilka (Nos. 7, 15, 19, 25, 26, 32, 40, 43, 46, 56), Konrad Derrer's *Geschichtenbuch* (Nos. 31, 36, 59, 60), *Disciplina clericalis* (No. 2, 62), *Historia septem Sapientum* (Nos. 29, 48, 64), *Erzählungen aus altdeutschen Handschriften,* ed. A. v. Keller (No. 3), *Erzählungen des Mittelalters,* ed. Klapper (No. 51), Étienne de Bourbon (No. 52), *Gesta Romanorum* (Nos. 13, 18, 21, 44, 47, 57), Harley MS. 3241, Brit. Mus. (No. 66), *Islendzk Aeventyri* (No. 17), Wright's *Latin Stories* (Nos. 11, 61), *Liber Exemplorum,* ed. A. J. Little (No. 9), Juan Manuel (Nos. 16, 24, 49, 63), *Noveau recueil de Contes,* ed. Jubinal (No. 45), *Novelle antiche* (Nos. 12, 23, 30, 34, 39, 50, 65), Pelbart (Nos. 6, 14, 42), *Predigtmärlein,* ed. Pfeffer (No. 5), Romulus (No. 58), Solomon and Marcolfus (No. 8), *Scala Celi* (Nos. 10, 20, 28, 35), Giov. Sercambi (Nos. 1, 27, 37), *Toldoth Jeschua* (No. 22), *Jacques de Vitry* (Nos. 4, 33, 38, 54).

Among the well known stories represented in the collection are: Vengeance deferred (No. 9), Maiden without Hands (No. 10), The Thankful Dead (No. 12), Two Travellers (No. 14), Godfather Death (No. 17), The Three Caskets (No. 18), The Three Clever Brothers (No. 20), Taming of the Shrew (No. 24), Water of Life (No. 28), Robber and his Sons (No. 29), Three Magic Objects: Ring, Brooch, Carpet (No. 44), Placidus (No. 47), Father sheltered (No. 48), Proud King (No. 49), Don Juan, the dead Guest (No. 51), Ungrateful Man, Grateful Beasts (No. 56), Abbot and Shepherd (No. 60), Pound of Flesh (No. 61).

The notes to the individual stories, "Zur Geschichte und Verbreitung der Märchen," fill eighty pages and are of the greatest interest and value. Some of these notes, for example those to Nos. 3, *Die Verschenkten Lebensjahre;* 14, *Die Wette um die Augen,* 37, *Scharfsinnsproben,* 61, *Das Fleischpfand,* and 66, *Der Glaube versetzt Berge* are almost of the dimension of essays. The nature of these notes will be better understood after an examination of the preface, pp. xi-xxiii.

Wesselski begins at once with an attack on the Finnish school of *märchen*-investigation.[1] He says: "the wider and deeper the influence of the Finnish school of *märchen*-investigation penetrates, the greater is the triumph of the so-called folk *märchen* over the so-called literary *märchen.* While one values a tale taken down from the mouth of a Gypsy, provided it is quite evidently not distorted, as a conclusive document, one considers a brief story written down by some mediaeval preacher as only an artificial product, a mixture deliberately put together, in which not only each element as to its veracity and originality, but in addition the way and manner of their combination must be proved by their agreement with the vagrant phantom, and at best the result of this examination is that by further investigation the version which for centuries has belonged to literature is placed on the same level with the traditional form narrated in a parish of the far north."

Wesselski continues his attack by a reference to the story of "The Two Travellers" (Grimm, No. 107), which he gives in a version of Oswald Pelbart, a Franciscan preacher of the end of the fifteenth century. He says, p. xii, "This *märchen* has not been chosen without design as an example. It is one of the few *märchen* to which the Finnish method of investigation has been literally applied. The results of this investigation are, as one can convince himself from our note to Pelbart's *märchen,* entirely false.

[1] I have examined this method at length in my notice of the *F. F. Communications* in the *Romanic Review*, vol. VII, pp. 118, *et seq.;* one of the *Communications*, No. 24, containing Christiansen's monograph on "The Two Travellers" (Grimm, No. 107), I have treated in the *Romanic Review, ut supra*, pp. 189, *et seq.* Wesselski lays particular stress on this in his preface, pp. xi-xii, and, at greater length, in his notes to No. 14, "Die Wette um die Augen," pp. 203, *et seq.*

Of course the fault is probably the superficiality and carelessness of the investigator, but the chief fault lies in the views on which the method is based."

The investigator who is so harshly judged is Christiansen, the above-mentioned author of an admirable monograph on this story in No. 24 of the *F. F. Communications,* whose conclusion briefly is that the earliest form of the tale is found in India and harmonizes best with the whole tale-milieu there. He concludes that the tale came to Europe partly in a literary form, and partly in an oral tradition, the former passing through Southern Europe where it has become the familiar type, the latter passing through the Slavonic world on its way westward.

Wesselski's conclusion, p. 208, is that the *märchen* may have arisen somewhat as follows: a feature originally Indian—good and bad brother, blinding of the good by the bad, restoration of the sight of the good brother by a just fate—has in its wandering from literature to literature lost on the one hand the single trait, that the actors in the story are brothers; on the other hand has taken up the union of two features unknown in India—overhearing and failure of imitation. The one who first carried through this amalgum may have been a Jew (see the Hebrew apologue of the Jew and the heathen),[2] who learned the rest perhaps from a Persian-Arabian intermediary—unfortunately no intermediate link has yet been discovered which would substantially support this view.

Wesselski's selections (as is also the case in his former work) are almost exclusively of a literary character, as distinguished from the so-called folk-tale, or *märchen,* as it is generally termed. Wesselski sees no difference in these and declares, p. xxii, that every new discovery gives a fresh proof that the *märchen* follows the same laws as all other literature. This is clear, he remarks, also

[2] The apologue here mentioned is cited on p. 204, from M. Gaster, *Folklore,* VII, 231: A Jew and a heathen wager as to which is the better man. Satan in various shapes pronounces the heathen the better. The Jew, penniless, sleeps out in the open air and overhears the talk of three demons. He learns from it how he has been deceived, how the emperor's daughter cannot give birth to her child and what must be done to make a spring bring forth water again. The Jew becomes rich by the knowledge of these secrets. The heathen who imitates the Jew's actions is killed by the demons.

from the study of the *märchen* of our own past. Aarne himself considers the middle ages as one of the epochs which produced an especially large number of *märchen,* and thinks that future investigation will probably show that many European *märchen* are mediaeval. Wesselski adds, that when Aarne wrote this the first volume only of Bolte and Polívka's notes to Grimm had appeared, and this acknowledgment is based upon the enormous amount of material there amassed. The later volumes show by many proofs what a treasure of the long despised *märchen* fund is to be dug out in the writings of those by gone times.

The writer of this review has long been convinced of the futility of classification in this field, and believes that so far as the question of diffusion is concerned there is no difference between *märchen* and *schwänke.* As to the materials of these stories and their origin it is not so clear and Wesselski's remarks on this topic in his preface, pp. xiv *et seq.,* are worth careful consideration. Apparently he considers the incidents in folk tales to have arisen naturally out of the various relations of human life, modified later by the traditional memories of earlier stages of civilization. The diffusion of tales already formed he ascribes to converts and immigrants, including slaves in the Orient and in the Europe of early mediaeval days. Soldiers and traders were more influential than ecclesiastics who were hampered by their religious views. Perhaps it will appear that among the traders it was the Jew who brought the most from the land of classical story-telling to the Occident and left here and there as a recompense one of the tales familiar to him.

So after all it is to Benfey that we must return!

T. F. CRANE.

Cornell University.

RECENT FRENCH TEXT BOOKS

One is tempted, after looking through some of the recently published grammars, to agree with Pierre Nozièrè when he asks: "A quoi bon ajouter à tout ce papier noirci quelques pages encore? Il serait meilleur de ne point écrire." There seems no reason for publishing, for instance, such a grammar as the *Advanced French*

Grammar, a Lexicologic, Syntactic, Philologic and Literary Finishing Course for Colleges and Scholars, by Ch. M. Marchand, Honorary Instructor in the French Language, Paris and the United States." [1] One is ready to be impressed. One is, but not in the way the author intended. The book is an undigested collection of facts and near-facts, put together with very little system, and with no index to guide one through the labyrinth. If one ever desired to utilize some of the information given, such as, for example, "suffixes désignant les habitants des villes de France," it would be much easier to turn to the *Petit Larousse* where one would find in less time what one desired. In the concluding words of the preface, the author modestly informs us that "this important treatise may be profitably consulted for grammatical researches and as a literary guide." One can dismiss the last contention in a word by saying that he mentions Voltaire and André Chénier as belonging to the Renaissance (p. 435). Whether the work may be consulted for grammatical researches, the reader can judge for himself. We find the following bit of wisdom at the head of the second chapter: "The gender of French nouns is the main cause for the agreement of articles, adjectives, pronouns and participles." Again (p. 58): "The definite article *le, la, les,* comes before every general noun used alone, contrary to the English usage, as it is the only way to recognize its gender and number." It would be interesting to learn how *les* indicates gender. Again (p. 59): "The definite article is not repeated before the second of two adjectives joined by *et,* referring to the same noun, as in English." He manifestly says one thing and means another. There are other similar examples of faulty English which the collaborator, who is an American, should have corrected. For example (p. 60): "The definite article is used with the names of some famous artists, as it is done in the Italian language," "the present indicative comes with *si*" (p. 201); instead of 'aquarella' (p. 68) English employs 'watercolor' as an equivalent of 'aquarelle.' To these one can add examples of faulty French such as the following from which it would seem that there are six conjugations: "Le participe revêt des terminaisons différentes selon les diverses conjugaisons: parlé, fini, reçu, offert, écrit, mis" (p. 268). There are many misstatements of grammatical principles of which space permits giving only a few.

[1] Brentano's.

On page 73 we find: "If the adverb of quantity is restricted by a relative clause, the partitive is used," and his examples show plainly that there is no partitive idea at all: "J'ai lu beaucoup des livres que vous m'avez prêtés." The article is used here because it particularizes the noun, as is the case in all the examples cited as exceptions on page 74 and 75. He is wrong in stating (p. 74) that general negations require only *de* instead of a partitive; that the feminine form 'hébreue' is used in speaking of women (p. 110); that 'un bonhomme' means a simpleton (p. 122); that 'prochain' refers only to time (p. 136); that disjunctive pronouns are used after all prepositions except à (p. 143); that 'penser' takes à instead of *de* (p. 147); that *l'on* never begins a sentence (p. 173); that subject pronouns always follow the verb after 'aussi' (p. 179); that 'know how' is 'savoir comment' (p. 225); that there is any distinction between 'commencer à' and 'commencer de' (p. 233); that 'vouloir dire' is used only when the subject is a person (p. 255); that 'déranger' is used for persons exclusively (p. 376); that 'casuel' is the pay of *le petit commerçant* (p. 368) (it is used for the clergy); that 'plus' is used only between the terms of a comparison and may not end a sentence (p. 290); that *ne . . . que* is negative (p. 290); that "est-ce que vous parlez bien le français?" means "Is it so that you speak French well?" (p. 177); that there is any certainty in "croyez-vous qu'il pleuvra" or "je ne crois pas qu'il pleuvra" (p. 211); that "reflexive verbs are those in which the subject and direct object are the same person doing and receiving the action"—(*ils se sont lavé les mains* would not then be reflexive); that *moi* and *toi* become *me* and *te* before *y* and *en* "in order to avoid hiatus" (p. 146) (it is because tonic forms are not used in atonic position); that nationality is a physical quality (p. 121); that the chapter heading "Epineux Cas de Syntaxe" is as good French as "Cas de Syntaxe Epineux." In many places throughout the book (p. 146, 150, etc.) more prominence is given to the wrong forms than to the right. This is bad pedagogy. There are exercises at the end of each chapter—English sentences to be translated into French—which are of the degree of difficulty usually found in elementary grammars. Another section comprises "Vieux textes français" which are to be put into modern French after referring to a four-page glossary of Old French at the back of the book. That is bad enough, but there is next

encountered a section called 'Exercice oral' in which one is to reply in French to questions like the following: "La morale naturelle peut-elle remplacer la morale religieuse? Donner quelques-uns des 30 noms servant à désigner les profits du labeur. Donnez le plus possible de 73 mots composant la famille de *lire*, des 90 formant celle de *poser*." There are several misprints: (p. 56) for 'Français,' read français; (p. 80) for 'evitées,' read évitées; (p. 199) for 'diner,' read dîner; (p. 201) for 'dinerons,' read dînerons; (p. 208 for § 751, read § 753; (p. 278) for 'le peu de salade *qui* j'ai mangée,' read 'que'; (p. 391) for 'Monte-di-Pieta,' read Monte-di-Pietà; (p. 406) for 'ou médit,' read on médit; (p. 435) for 'Sédaine,' read Sedaine; (p. 440) for 'Grébon,' read Gréban.

Another grammar which cannot be recommended [2] is a book resulting from the teaching of officers and soldiers during the war. It does not lend itself to use in schools or colleges, for there are no exercises, no divisions into lessons, no vocabulary, no index. There are long word lists which are impedimenta. There are many misstatements regarding the grammatical material. *Y* and *en*, for example, are not relative pronouns, nor are reflexive verbs those "of which the subject and the object are the same" (p. 58), nor does the subjunctive express a fact (p. 64) nor is "il me faut aller" considered good French.

Another book to be censured for employing word-lists to excess [3] is a beginning book for students in French—a combined grammar and reader prepared for high school pupils. It is too elementary for college use; the tone of the book is childish at times, even for high school pupils. Most of the illustrations portray children of nine or ten years of age, and the inclusion of songs is unnecessary. Of what interest is it to anyone to have starred in the vocabularies the words which are in the list prepared by the New York Society for the Experimental Study of Education? There is no phonetic transcription, but plenty of drill in pronunciation in each lesson, an element which is commendable, although there is too much grammatical material in each lesson. The book is carefully printed. It should be noted, however, that the accent is rarely written in French over capital A, as the author consistently writes it through-

[2] Catherine J. P. Hill, *Essentials of Practical French*, Cornhill Publishing Company.

[3] Lawrence A. Wilkins, *First French Book*, Holt and Company.

out the book, nor is the accent written over the capital *I* in *île*; the French would write "des Îles Vierges" (p. 184). It is a matter of personal conviction whether or not the rules of grammar should be given in French; it seems that better results are obtained if one is sure that the student thoroughly understands the rules and does not merely learn them parrot-like as is apt to be the case if they are given in French. On the whole, the rules are clearly stated. It is not correct, however, to say (p. 97): "When the partitive noun follows a negative, *de* alone expresses *some* or *any*." In the first place, when would *some* be used in a negative sentence in English? In the second place, the rule does not cover such cases as "Nous ne sommes pas des juges," nor is it consistent with the statement (p. 98) that *ne . . . que* is negative, and that one would say: "ce ne sont que des perles." Of course, *ne . . . que* is not negative. The statement regarding the employment of the dieresis in such words as 'aiguë' is not clear, nor can 'mes papiers' (p. 60) be called singular. There are occasional slips from good French. One does not say (p. 23): "Ils venaient souvent nous visiter," for one does not 'visiter' a person. I never heard a Frenchman call a taxi a 'taximètre,' nor is it good French to say (p. 155): "J'ai payé sept dollars pour les souliers." No Frenchman would say: "Je demeure *dans* la rue La Fayette" and I question whether he would say: "Qu'est-ce que c'est que *ceci*." No subjunctive is employed, nor are the forms given. There is no special arrangement; grammatical principles are mentioned as they occur in the French texts selected.

There have recently been published two books employing the direct method (the latter complete in itself and including those matters dealt with in Book I). The material in both books is well presented; the rules, given in French, are clearly stated. Both volumes [4] can be criticized for employing too extensive vocabularies in the lessons. Many of the words given occur very rarely. How frequently would one have occasion, for example, to refer to one's 'annulaire' or one's 'auriculaire'? Another matter which is pernicious is the endeavor to approximate the sound of French vowels and consonants by way of the nearest English equivalent. Is it to be expected that the student by pronouncing 'yank' will know how

[4] G. P. Fougeray, *The Mastery of French*, Direct Method, Books I and II, Iroquois Publishing Company.

to pronounce 'pain' (p. xxii), or in fact that any of the nasal or mixed vowels can be approached in this manner? The rule for the agreement of the past participle is wrongly stated in both books (ii, p. 86): "Il s'accorde toujours avec le sujet quand il est conjugué avec être," wherein no mention is made of reflexive verbs. The last half of Book II abandons the direct method and becomes a reference grammar, giving lists of the commoner idioms, which are useful. At the back of both books are lists of words employed in each lesson. It may be beneficial to furnish groups of words having a certain connection, but the general practice of employing word-lists seems unsatisfactory.

The *Elementary French Grammar,* by Professors McKenzie and Hamilton[5] is an attractively printed grammar, illustrated with pictures of young people of college age. The book is so simplified that it ought to be very easy for the average student. All exceptions are disregarded, and although many of the commoner French idioms and grammatical points are omitted, the essentials are given, and in general, very succinctly and clearly stated. The misstatement is again made that "*some* or *any* is expressed by *de* alone if the phrase is negative" (p. 52). Nothing is said (p. 147) of the use of 'celui.' If 'comparative degree' is defined (p. 17) as "indicating that one thing has more of a quality than another," how can the comparative of an adverb be formed by placing 'aussi' before it (p. 178)? The lessons seem too simple for college students, especially in the first half of the book, but maybe it is better to be sure of having a limited knowledge of the grammar well assimilated, than to endeavor to cover too much ground. Perhaps one reason for the simplicity is found expressed in the exercise on page 206: "Nous sommes de l'ouest, et nous aimons mieux une Université de l'ouest! Je ne sais pas, mais j'aurais peut-être mieux fait d'aller à Harvard; j'aurais beaucoup plus étudié là où il n'y a pas tant de jeunes filles!" The lessons deal with every-day subjects which ought to be interesting to the students. It is satisfying to see that *ne . . . que* is not called negative. Inasmuch as many students enter college with no adequate idea of English grammar, it is a good idea to give, as is here done, the definition of the parts of speech at the beginning of the book. Why then do the authors try to make a proper noun out of the common noun 'university.'

[5] The Century Company.

writing it with a capital U throughout, and likewise 'Professors' with a capital P? There are a few misprints. In defining an impersonal verb (p. 18), read 'third person singular'; for 'adjourd'hui' (p. 117), read 'aujourd'hui'; for 'pouquoi' (p. 117), read 'pourquoi'; for 'ertain' (p. 177), read 'certain'; for 'quevou s' (p. 223), read 'que vous'; for 'abstract nouns in -tie' (p. 248), read '-tié.' õ is perhaps purposely represented throughout by ō, but why depart from accepted usage?

A Travers la France[6] is primarily a collection of *morceaux choisis,* selected as representative of the best in modern French thought. These texts are preceded by a diary, written in French, of a young American who visits France. It is rather puzzling to know how such a book might be employed, for although there are cross-references between the two parts, the connection seems rather artificial. It seems impossible to gain in a selection of a page or two an adequate idea of any author as diversified as Anatole France or Balzac, no matter how representative the chosen passage may be. The biographical notices, especially in the case of such writers as Hugo, Maupassant, Balzac, and others, are of no great value. One wonders at the exclusion of Alphonse Daudet. It is strange to speak of 'la présente guerre' in a book dated 1923. The father of Anatole France was not one of the "bouquinistes des quais" (p. 71), but a *libraire* on the Quai Voltaire. The book would probably be helpful to someone with a limited knowledge of modern authors, who desired to acquaint himself with recent French thought.

There has recently appeared a combined reader and composition book to be used in beginning classes.[7] The topics treated should be interesting to the average student and the vocabulary seems adequate (although there is no phonetic transcription). There are a few matters that can be corrected in the next edition. The past definite should not be used in questions (cf. p. 184, 188, 190, etc.). The capital *A* throughout the book is written with the accent, contrary to French usage; the student would look in vain in the vocabulary for help in saying "pass an examination." The usual

[6] A Travers la France, choix de textes précédé du journal de voyage d'un étudiant américain, par Félix Bertaut et Hélène Harvitt, Oxford University Press.

[7] Eugène F. Maloubier, *Au Jour le Jour,* Heath and Company.

version regarding Ponce de Leon (p. 80) is that he did not find the spring of youth. Unusual words and expressions such as 'prendre froid,' 'peu s'en faut que,' 'de-ci de-là,' 'de vive voix' might be avoided, also the boston and quadrille sound rather antiquated (p. 58).

Two collections of stories by recent French writers [8] are worthy of mention. The first is too difficult to be used before the last part of the second year, and some of the stories are too sentimental. The vocabulary and notes of both are adequate, although both define 'pourpre' as 'purple.'

RALPH C. WILLIAMS.

Johns Hopkins University.

Festschrift für Konrad Zwierzina (zum 29. März 1924). Graz, Wien, Leipzig: Verlag Leuschner und Lubensky, 1924:

JELLINEK, M. H., *Otfrids grammatische und metrische Bemerkungen.* 16 pp. M. 0.80.

KRAUS, C. VON, *Zu Walthers Elegie* (124, 1–125, 10). 13 pp. M. 0.80.

SINGER, S., *Ruodlieb.* 23 pp. M. 0.80.

The above three titles constitute a *Festschrift* for Konrad Zwierzina on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday. A fourth greeting from Professor Seuffert, not technically a part of this volume and concerned also with a problem in a more modern field, will receive separate consideration in a later issue. Of a memorial volume dealing with Old German studies no one certainly was more worthy than Zwierzina, whose notable series of *Mittelhochdeutsche Studien* especially (*ZfdA.* 44 and 45) not only settled definitely numberless disputed points in Middle High German grammatical usage but blazed new paths in the matter of methodology as well. If this volume has in size and appearance none of the sumptuousness of such publications in the Reich, this is readily explained by the difficulties with which life in the Old Austria is, financially, beset.

[8] Régis Michaud, *Conteurs français d'aujourd'hui,* Heath and Company, and *Stories by Contemporary French Novelists,* ed. by Marion E. Bowler, Ginn and Company.

Jellinek, as the historian of German grammar, deals with Otfrid's remarks on grammar and metrics in the Preface "Ad Liutbertum." In Zwierzina's doctoral dissertation (1886) and in his first printed article (*ZfdA.* 31, 292-297) the same general topic, the points of contact between Otfrid's observations and the terminology and statements of Latin grammarians, received treatment. Jellinek's article supplements these older studies of Zwierzina. Basing largely on a recent Königsberg dissertation of W. O. Neumann, *De barbarismo et metaplasmo quid Romani docuerint* (1917), he discusses the provenience and meanings of the term "metaplasmus." A number of correspondences are shown to exist between Otfrid and the Latin grammarian Donatus, and these observations are further fortified by tracing, very plausibly, an incorrect "videbatur ascribi" (Erdmann, line 63) to a wholly correct "adscribi" of Donatus. Of particular interest are Jellinek's statements concerning the system of punctuation found in the Vienna MS. of Otfrid, and toward the end of the article, where he leaves the subject of Otfrid's Preface, on the subject of the elision of inflectional *-e* in adjectives in Opitz. On the latter subject he takes sharp issue with the conclusions arrived at by Baesecke.

Kraus's contribution is a discussion of the metrical form of Walther von der Vogelweide's *Elegie* (Lachmann 124, 1–125, 10). Applying the same acribi to the metrical problem that has distinguished his studies in the field of Middle High German grammatical usage, he arrives at the conclusion that the poem originally had the rhythm of the Nibelungen line. While eleven of the forty-eight verses do not as handed down respond to this interpretation, Kraus eliminates five of these as clearly showing faulty scribal transmission.[1] The proportion that the six lines not yielding to corrective treatment represent of the entire number of lines under consideration is then shown to be far smaller than in the case of other poems of Walther when an attempt is made to force six-beat lines with masculine ending into the jacket of the Nibelungen verse form. The disproportion is, in fact, found to be almost

[1] It is not altogether clear why I, 7 is emended on page 7 but listed on page 12 as one of six cases left unexplained. Note 7 on this latter page repeats the list of page 8 but adds I, 7.

that between 1/2 and 1/7. An explanation of the corrupt state of the text is found in the hypothesis that the present form is due to a conscious attempt to revise the Nibelungen lines into six-beat lines with alternating rhythm. A rather interesting generalization concludes the paper. The Kürenberg strophe, says Kraus, started in Austria as a lyric measure. The Austrian poet of the Nibelungen employed it as an epic stanza; but the Austrian Walther, changing the form, brought it back to the lyric sphere. Such is the cycle of life in art as well.

In his *Ruodlieb* Professor Singer of Bern rather startlingly takes us to the market-place of a Rhenish city where a Bavarian cleric is watching what purports to be the eleventh century counterpart of the modern varieté. The scenes enacted on the improvised stage of the market place make a most colorful picture and it is all so vividly drawn that one sees it go on before one's eyes. The purpose is to show, by a synthesis, how such a complex as the *Ruodlieb* might be conceived as having arisen. The synthesis of Part I is followed by an analysis in Part II, in which an attempt is made to trace the widely ramified connections of the Ruodlieb story. The drop from the vivid narrative of the first part to the matter-of-fact *Gelehrtenstil* of the second half comes, to be sure, with somewhat of a shock.

The opening situation is shown to be typical of the chanson de geste and parallels are pointed out with the epic of *Isembard and Gormond* as handed down to us in *Loher and Maller,* a fifteenth century German translation of a prose version. The French *Gormon et Isembart* is known to have existed as early as 1088. Singer's thesis assumes that it existed at least fifty years earlier, and he would urge this very parallelism with *Ruodlieb* as an argument for so early a date. It furnishes, in fact, the earliest date for an example of the transference of an epic motif from France to Germany. The parallels presented by Singer are certainly very striking. Illuminating also are the remarks on the herb *buglossa* (for these a Strassburg dissertation by Rosenthaler is drawn upon) as an aid in fishing and the hunting of wolves. It is conclusively shown that these stories are not mere fables but rest on facts in natural history, reflected even now in existent plant names.

Indiana University. B. J. Vos.

Les Langues du Monde, par un groupe de linguistes sous la direction de A. MEILLET et MARCEL COHEN (Collection Linguistique publiée par la Société Linguistique de Paris, XVI; Paris, Librairie Ancienne Edouard Champion, 1924. 811 pp., 18 plates of maps).

To the tireless energies of Prof. A. Meillet, the distinguished Indo-Europeanist, we owe this admirable review of the languages of the world. The work could hardly have been undertaken except as here planned and carried out, that is, by a number of linguistic specialists. It is true that works of a similar nature, such as Friedrich Müller's *Grundriss der Sprachwissenschaft* and A. Trombetti's *Elementi di Glottologia,* have been written by individual scholars, but, on the whole, it was probably wise to sacrifice something of unity of treatment to the greater authoritativeness that was bound to result from a division of labor.

The parts into which the book falls are: an Introduction, by A. Meillet; Indo-European, by J. Vendryes; Hamito-Semitic, by Marcel Cohen (it is with great satisfaction that one sees a conservative book of this type recognizing the fundamental points of accord that have long been pointed out between Semitic and "Hamitic" to the point of frankly uniting them into a single genetic group); Finno-Ugrian and Samoyed, by A. Sauvageot; Turkish, Mongol, and Tungusic Languages, by J. Deny; Japanese; Corean; Ainu; "Hyperborean" Languages (i. e., Chukchee, Yukagir, and Gilyak), all four by S. Élisséèv; Special Languages of the Ancient Near East (particularly Sumerian, Elamite, Hittite, Lydian, and Etruscan), by C. Autran; Basque, by George Lacombe; Northern Caucasic Languages, by N. Troubetzkoy; Southern Caucasic Languages, by A. Meillet; Dravidian, by Jules Bloch; Sino-Tibetan, by J. Przyluski (this term is much to be preferred to the misleading "Indo-Chinese" that has been current; "Sinic" is perhaps even better); Austroasiatic Languages (Mon-Khmer, Annamite, and Muṇḍā), by J. Przyluski; Malayo-Polynesian, by Gabriel Ferrand (Papuan Languages, which do not properly belong here, are briefly treated at the end of this section); Australian Languages, by A. Meillet; Languages of the Soudan and of Guinea, by Maurice Delafosse; Bantu, by Miss L. Homburger; Bushman and Hottentot, by Miss L. Homburger;

and American Languages, by P. Rivet. There is an adequate equipment of bibliographies and maps and an excellent index. All in all, the book is an achievement and no serious student of general linguistics or descriptive anthropology can afford to do without it. That it will need to be replaced by another work of similar scope in a few decades goes without saying (certain of its paragraphs became antiquated in the writing!) but for the present it is indispensable.

Just because this work is so precious for the linguist it will not seem ungracious if we point out certain shortcomings. In the first place a number of important languages have slipped out from under the specialists. The editors and their staff will be chagrined to discover that the Andaman group, which includes a considerable number of quite distinct dialects or languages, and the isolated Siberian group to which belong "Yenissei Ostyak" (to be carefully distinguished from the Ugro-Finnic "Ostyak" and from the "Ostyak" dialect of Samoyed) and Kott are entirely omitted. Both of these isolated families are treated in considerable detail in Trombetti's *Elementi* and both are of crucial importance for the early linguistic history of Asia. Trombetti produces some evidence, by no means to be despised, which tends to connect the Yenissei Ostyak group with Sino-Tibetan. A mere glance at F. N. Finck's useful little *Sprachstämme des Erdkreises* would have insured at least a mention of the two groups. A more excusable omission is that of Zandawe, a language recently discovered in east central Africa and showing unmistakable resemblances to the Bushman and Hottentot languages far to the south (see Trombetti). The historical importance of this language is obvious.

A second and probably more serious criticism is the lack of a consistent plan in the treatment of the various sections. Mechanical uniformity was rightly rejected by the editors, but they have gone to the opposite extreme. As it is, certain languages or groups of languages receive an altogether disproportionate share of attention. In some sections a good deal of useful information is given on the morphology of the languages listed, in others there is considerable detail of a bibliographical and geographical nature but no vitalizing hints as to the nature of the languages themselves, in still others a vast field is dismissed with a few perfunc-

tory remarks and a shrug of the shoulders. The editors cannot honestly retort that they have had to omit all grammatical discussion where none is given in the book because of the scantiness of the data. As a matter of fact, the descriptive material available in many such cases is of a very high order of merit. There would have been no more essential difficulty, for instance, in giving some elementary idea of Algonkin or Siouan or Athabaskan or Maya structure than of Hottentot or Polynesian structure and such indications would have added immeasurably to the value of the work, which now hovers uncertainly between the geographical listing of groups and sub-groups and the morphological discussion of languages. The ideal method would probably have been to combine the two, as in the admirable section on Hamito-Semitic, which could well have spared, on the other hand, a great deal of its rather irrelevant historical detail.

One other point. It was cruel to assign the vast field of American Indian languages to a single specialist. No one person living today could even begin to get his bearings in it, let alone do justice to it. It might have been necessary for the editors to go outside of France and to secure the coöperation of at least one specialist for North America north of Mexico and another for Mexico and Central America, leaving the South American field in the hands of M. Rivet, who is obviously the one best qualified to handle it. If it was the intention of the editors to show how well an essentially international task could be carried out with the splendid resources of French scholarship alone, all we can say is that they must be congratulated on coming as near solving an impossible task as it was reasonably possible to do.

E. SAPIR.

Ottawa, Ont.

William Dean Howells, A Study by OSCAR W. FIRKINS. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1924.

The substantial volume which Mr. Firkins has devoted to William Dean Howells is not a biography, though it begins with a chapter on his life; nor is it an appreciation, though it involves a careful estimate of his works from the least to the greatest, for

the evaluation is coolly objective and the "heart somehow seems all squeezed out by the mind." It is a thorough-going analysis of the personality of Howells and of his literary output. A glance at the structure of the book gives one a new sense of the versatility and the amazing industry of a long and placid life. A chapter entitled "Memories and Portraits" includes comment on seven more or less autobiographical books; another styled "Journeyings and Parleyings" deals with fifteen devoted to travel or to a blend of travel and fiction; thirty-one novels and nine tales or novelettes stretch Chapter IV into 170 pages; and there remain to be considered plays running beyond a score of titles, a rather thin output of verse, and a body of criticism best guaged by its range over forty-five authors and half a dozen languages. A chapter on the style of Howells, another on his humor, and a third which, briefly, hazards a few guesses as to his future fame complete the book. A bibliography, exhaustive as to works by Howells and generally suggestive as to critical comment upon him, is added as appendix.

The chief merit of Mr. Firkins's method is its completeness. His examination of the large and varied literary product of Howells is encyclopedic and his judgment is acute and stimulating, particularly in what is materially the most useful part of the book —the discussion of the novels. Completeness demanded an assay of the verse; but it is difficult to give assent even to the qualified praise of the hexameters and still less to follow the critic in his approval of the later poems. Howells has obvious limitations and none more conspicuous than his entire lack of lyric gift. In spite of Stedman's protest, his sole field was prose. The recent discovery of the Lanier letter to Edward Spencer which recounts the manner and the grounds of Howells's rejection of "Corn" for the "Atlantic" raises serious questions as to the editor's judgment of the lyric gift in others. A glance at the verse which he did accept for successive issues in the mid-seventies betrays a remarkable bluntness of perception in one whose claim to eminence as a critic is so well-founded.

With Howells's merits as a stylist and the consequent value of his works of autobiography and travel Mr. Firkins might be more sympathetic. A little unconcern about small jangles of diction or idioms is more than offset by a really remarkable power of quiet and sure simplicity of style, a simplicity all the more admirable

in contrast with the glittering smartness of the prose most in favor today.

In his estimate of the verdict of posterity Mr. Firkins is, wisely, very guarded. What the future will think of Howells is a matter about which prediction is exceptionally difficult. The matter which is beyond question is the present interest and significance of the broad region which he so quietly ruled as his demesne and the timely value of such a Baedeker for it as Mr. Firkins has provided.

The Johns Hopkins University. JOHN C. FRENCH.

CORRESPONDENCE

OLD FRENCH *prendre a,* "TO BEGIN"

Throughout the Old French period the two verbs of beginning which recur constantly before a complementary infinitive are *comencier a* and *prendre a.*

> Alquant le prenent fortment a blastengier
> (*Alex.*, v. 317).
> De guarnemenz se prent a cunreer
> (*Rel.*, v. 343).
> Par mi les rues les commence a guier
> (*Charr. de Nymes*, v. 1164).
> Ses nies Bertrans li commence a dire
> (*Prise d'Orange*, v. 334).

These constructions first interested me because, strange to say, the pronoun object of the complementary infinitive does not here follow the usage which is the absolute rule with other prepositional infinitive constructions. The order with prepositional infinitives in Old French was invariably: preposition, tonic form of obj. pronoun, infinitive.

> e. g. Qu'a lui servir ai mon tens si usé
> (*Charr. de Nymes*, v. 427).
> Qu'ele daignast a moi touchier
> (Gautier d'Arras, *Eracle*, ed. Löseth, v. 3777).
> Car folie est de soi grever
> (*Ibid.*, v. 4602).

The order in the case of the pure infinitive construction was: atonic obj. pronoun, governing verb, infinitive, as in

> Li chevals porte halt le chief
> Que il nel pot mie baillier
> (*Gorm. et Isemb.*, v. 311-312).
> Il la fist seeler a force et a vertut
> (*Pèl. Charl.*, v. 200).

These two types remained, as far as the pronoun usage was concerned, well into the 17th century for the pure infinitive, and into the 14th and 15th in the case of the prepositional.[1] *Prendre a* and *comencier a* were employed as though the *a* were not there.

I have sought to find the origin of this use of *prendre,* in the sense of "to begin" before a complementary infinitive. As far as I have observed neither *capio* nor *prehendo* has ever had such a meaning in Classical Latin. The explanation, I believe, lies in the following.

The defective verb *coepi* gave *cepi* early, (oe > e). We find it spelled sometimes *cepi* and sometimes *coepi* (undoubtedly through conservatism of spelling), as in

. .. . . *cepimus* ascendere montes singulos
(*Peregrin.*, ed. Heraeus, iii, 1).
Ac sic ergo . . . . *cepimus* festinare
(*Ibid.*, x, 8).
Tunc ergo gratias ei agere *coepi*
(*Ibid.*, xv, 2).
At ubi autem *ceperit* se mane facere . . . .
(*Ibid.*, xxix, 3).
Cum autem *coeperit* episcopus venire . . . .
(*Ibid.*, xxv, 2).
Ceperunt primum homines mihi calumniari
(*Ps. Kallisth.*, iii, 8).

Cepi soon supplanted *coepi* almost entirely. When this happened *cepi* became isolated in the minds of the vulgar speakers. They therefore associated it with the only verb to which it could be attached, *capio, capere, cepi, captus.* As this verb did not survive in Gaul, save in compounds, *prendo* < *prehendo* supplanted it in all instances, including it would seem the supposed instance now under consideration. But early Romance with its freer use of prepositions, after simple verbs as well as before nouns to express case relation, found that an *a* was needed to make *prendo* "begin" more intelligible.[2] As this was probably added after the order of the pronouns had become more or less fixed, *prendo a* plus the infinitive continued to be used as *prendre* plus infin. *Comencier a* would follow as an analogous construction.

Our modern English "take to doing" as far as I can ascertain is a descendant from the Old French construction.

U. T. HOLMES.

University of Missouri.

[1] I have discussed these constructions in detail in my doctoral dissertation submitted to the faculty of Harvard University, entitled, *The Order of the Unemphatic Object Pronoun in Old French.* This has not been published and I do not believe there is any immediate likelihood of its being so.

[2] Looked upon as expressing motion towards (?). Compare modern *se mettre à.*

CONCERNING JAMES MILL

A careless turn of phrase in Leslie Stephen's article on James Mill in the *Dictionary of National Biography,* last edition 1909, stating that Mill's contributions to periodicals between the years 1807-1813 cannot be identified, would appear to discourage an attempt to fix upon Mill the authorship of an article in the *Edinburgh Review* falling within the limits of these years. That Leslie Stephen was indulging in an ambiguous paraphrase of information provided by the second chapter of Bain's *Life of Mill* (p. 62, London, 1882), to which later in the same article he refers his reader, becomes clear from a reading of Bain. The latter positively identifies no less than fourteen of Mill's contributions to the *Edinburgh* during the years in question. I mention Leslie Stephen's oversight merely because the shadow of his name might cast doubt on what constitutes my main purpose in this note, namely: the addition of a not unimportant review to the list furnished by Bain.

The *Edinburgh* for April, 1809, carried as its fourteenth article a learned and powerfully written review of Thomas Taylor's translation of Plato (London, 1804). Among the known contributors not one, exclusive of Mill, possessed at once the requisite knowledge of Greek and detailed acquaintance with the Platonic philosophy sufficient to have written it. This general probability receives confirmation from the following particulars:

Protesting against the extravagances of the allegorical method in the hands of the Alexandrian sages, the reviewer cites Gibbon's *Decline and Fall,* vol. 4, p. 70, and immediately following quotes Jacob Bryant's *Analysis of Antient Mythology,* vol. 3, p. 104. Now in Mill's *History of British India,* begun in 1806 but not published until 1818 (vol. 1, p. 379 ff., 4th edition, London, 1848), occurs a protest against the abuse of the allegorical method as employed by certain scholars to reconcile the gross inconsistencies of the Hindu theology; and to confirm his point Mill quotes Gibbon, vol. 4, p. 71, and directly following on p. 381 we meet the citation from Bryant, vol. 3, p. 104.

Few, I take it, would be likely to admit the hypothesis of plagiarism where Mill is concerned, especially in so petty a matter. A far easier supposition is that the hard-driven reviewer whose time was seriously taxed between the demands of the *History of India* and the education of his son, John, was induced to plagiarize from himself and to practice the justifiable economy of making his copy serve double duty. This is the more likely in view of Bain's statement (p. 169, *ibid.*) that such actually was Mill's habit.

I may add that a considerate reading of the 1809 article will bring out further evidence of Mill's authorship, notably the side-attack upon the excessive attention given in the then schools of

England to Classical Prosody, to the neglect of more solid learning, with which passage we may compare his son's words in the *Autobiography,* p. 14. The sprightliness and humour with which he scores his points are not so much contradictory to our picture of the man as supplementary and corrective thereof.

RONALD B. LEVINSON.

University of Chicago.

SHAKESPEARE'S "SMALL LATIN"

Ben Jonson's dictum that Shakespeare "had small Latin and less Greek" has been so often quoted that many persons, without inquiring carefully into the matter, are prone to lay undue stress upon it. Surely no one believes that Shakespeare read as widely or as carefully in the classics as did Jonson; yet we are coming to see that Shakespeare possessed a better acquaintance, at least with Latin authors, than perhaps Jonson himself realized.

In the work of a little known Latin writer, Seneca the Rhetorician, occur two passages so similar to two closely related passages in *I Henry IV* as almost to compel the belief that Shakespeare had read them. If he did not, they furnish at least a remarkable and interesting coincidence. The situation in *Controversiae,* II, V is somewhat similar to Hotspur's position in *I Henry IV* in that a man has plotted against his king. After he has killed the tyrant, the question arises whether his wife had known of his plans.

In *I Hen. IV,* II. iii. 112, Hotspur, having refused to tell Lady Percy his secret, concludes:

for I well believe
Thou wilt not utter what thou dost not know;

In Seneca, *Cont.,* II. v. 12, the husband says:

"non enim tibi indicavi nec tam magnum consilium, virilibus quoque animis grave, commisi muliebri garrulitati, quae id solum potest tacere, quod nescit."

Again, in the same scene of *I Hen. IV,* ll. 40-65, Lady Percy describes the conduct of Hotspur, who has been keeping secret from her the conspiracy, and declares that his altered countenance, as well as the revelations into which sleep has betrayed him, has shown her that something is on his mind. In Seneca, *Cont.,* II. v. 20, a few lines after the quotation cited above, the husband says:

"nihil ego isti narraveram; ista, ut erat necesse, aliquid ex vultu, aliquid ex nocturnis vigiliis suspicata est."

May not this be at least the germ of the idea from which Shakespeare developed the magnificent description of Hotspur's disquietude?

Modern editors of *I Henry IV* have usually annotated Hotspur's reply by citing an old proverb, now in Ray's collection: "A woman will keep secret what she knows not." Is it not likely, however, considering the other parallel, that Shakespeare found both in Seneca?

MALCOLM L. WILDER.

Cornell University.

BERNARDIN DE SAINT-PIERRE AND CHARLOTTE BRONTË

Bernardin de Saint-Pierre's influence on the writers of the French Romantic school has been freely acknowledged by them and by contemporary and later critics. *Paul et Virginie* first introduced the picturesque vocabulary to French literature, and may be said to have given it a new direction, as well as color. Sainte-Beuve expresses it concisely. According to him, Chateaubriand is the father of Romanticism, Jean-Jacques the grandfather, and Bernardin de Saint-Pierre the rich uncle from India. Specially to be noted in B. de Saint-Pierre are his richness of color vocabulary, his use of the picturesque metaphor, the exquisite mixture of color and form in his cloudscapes. His was the pinceau of the Romanticists.

He had also his very devoted admirers outside of France, and at least one English writer was greatly in his debt. In 1849, Charlotte Brontë makes one of the characters in *Shirley* say, "Here are the posthumous works of B. de Saint-Pierre. Read a few pages of the '*Fragments de l'Amazone.*'" And a little later, "My newly bound St.-Pierre would be soon like my Racine." Specially high praise from Brontë who knew her Racine by heart. And then, after these specific acknowledgments, comes a description as much B. de Saint-Pierre as if he had written it himself.

"A calm day had settled into a crystalline evening: the world wore a North Pole coloring: all its lights and tints looked like the 'reflets' of white, or violet or pale green gems. The hills wore a lilac blue: the setting sun had purple in its red, the sky was blue, all silvered azure: when the stars rose, they were of white crystal—not gold: gray or cerulean or faint emerald hues, cool, pure and transparent—tinged the mass of the landscape."

No one who has read Bernardin de Saint-Pierre could fail to recognize him in every adjective and simile.

There is an even more striking passage in *The Professor,* published about 1847. The tone and coloring of this novel is very quiet, even drab, and there is no attempt to make it other than a restrained and colorless recital. The same story is expanded and

brightened in *Villette,* but there is only one touch of color in *The Professor,* and this again is a passage that could have been written only by the French writer or by someone greatly influenced by him.

"Already the pavement was drying: a balmy and fresh breeze stirred the air, purified by lightning: I felt the west behind me, where spread a sky like purple, azure intermingled with crimson: the enlarged sun, glorious in Tyrian dyes, dipped his brim already: stepping, as I was, eastward, I faced a vast bank of clouds, but also I had before me the arch of an even rainbow: a perfect rainbow, high, wide, vivid.—I at last fell asleep, and then in a dream was reproduced the setting sun, the bank of clouds, the mighty rainbow. I stood, methought, on a terrace: I leaned over a parapeted wall: there was space below me, depth I could not fathom, but hearing an endless splash of waves, I believed it to be the sea: sea spread to the horizon: sea of changeful green and intense blue: all was soft in the distance, all vapor-veiled. A spark of gold glistened on the line between air and water, floated up, appeared, enlarged, changed: the object hung midway between heaven and earth, under the arch of the rainbow: the soft but dark clouds diffused behind. It hovered as on wings; pearly, fleecy gleaming air streamed like raiment around it: light, tinted with carnation, colored what seemed face and limbs: a large star shone with still luster on an angel's forehead." The whole passage a vivid reproduction of half a dozen cloudscapes of Bernardin de Saint-Pierre.

The concluding page of *Villette* is too long to be quoted, but it is recommended to those who know the French writer and to every reader who loves restraint and pure beauty in nature description.

JNO. N. WARE.

Shorter College.

BRIEF MENTION

Die Entwicklung des k-Suffixes in den indogermanischen Sprachen. Von Ferdinand Ewald (Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1924). This short treatise offers a fairly complete collection of words formed with the suffix *k* in the Indo-European languages. After a brief discussion of the meaning and origin of suffixes in general, the author comments briefly upon the original adverbial nature of the particle *-k-* (cf. Greek ἐ-κεῖ; Latin *illī-c, sī-c, nun-c, ce-do;* Goth. *hi-mma* etc.). Out of these adverbial formations arose with the addition of inflectional endings adjectives (cf. Lat. *reciprocus* from **re-ke-proke*). Next the author takes up the *k*-suffix in substantives and adjectives, arranging his material according to the nature of the stems that

are expanded by this suffix (e. g. Sanskr. *dātrī*, Lat. *datrīx;* Lat. *novus—novī-c-ius;* Sanskr. *madhu—madhū-k-am*). In two short appendices are discussed the Lat. suffixes *-clom, -culum, -crum* and substantives in *-āgo, īgo, -ūgo.*

Apart from its valuable collection of material, the work is sound and treats in a clear and concise way, that could easily serve as a model for subsequent articles on other suffixes, an important chapter in Indo-Germanic word-formation.

E. H. S.

An Outline History of French Literature, by H. Stanley Schwarz, Ph. D. New York, A. A. Knopf, 1924. 163 pages. In the main, the plan is well carried out. Still it needs severe revision in many details. A book ought not to be given as reference to young students which is not personally known to the author. From the selections often made, and from the way they are arranged, we are forced to conclude that the author has been neglectful of the precaution. E. g., the *Renard* by Foulet, and that by Paulin Paris are two books so different in purpose that they do not belong on the same list,—one a scholarly study of the poems, the other an adaptation of the stories for children. J. Lemaitre's *Rousseau* must wonder why it stands next to Mrs. Macdonald's *J.-J. Rousseau, A New Criticism;* and if any of the two above are mentioned, why ignore Irving Babbitt? In the Balzac references for reading, one finds again studies of entirely different types, as the novelist's biography by his sister, Madame de Surville, and Lovenjoul's *Histoire des Oeuvres* which is of no use to young people. At least some sort of short comment ought to direct the reader. In no case does the author deem it worthwhile to distinguish between *Gaston* Paris and *Paulin* Paris. He mentions Pellissier's *Mouvement littéraire au XIXme siècle,* and not the volume which is the continuation. What has Zola † 1902 to do in twentieth century drama with his *Naturalisme au Théâtre,* and what Sarcey who died before the twentieth century had arrived? One does not see how such an indiscriminating list as the bibliography on twentieth century poetry (p. 153) can do anything but confuse the minds of the students. There is at times an *appearance* of thoroughness which ought rather to be avoided: e. g., why give the two editions of Victor Hugo's *Odes et Ballades* of 1822 and 1826? . . . or then why omit the first edition of the *Odes* in 1818? We would have much preferred for young students to see mentioned, under 'Bibliography of Eighteenth Century Poetry,' instead of Bertrand's *Latin du Classicisme* . . ., M. Allem's *An-*

thologie . . . avec introductions, notices et notes. A regrettable slip is found on p. 78 when the French XVIIIth century is given as under the influence of Schiller, Herder and Kant. . . .

The above mentioned inaccuracies,—and *many* others,—ought to be eradicated. The task is not an easy one to prepare a book of this kind; but then, why, if one undertakes it, not have some specialist check the various chapters?

A. S.

The Two Dated Sonnets of Shakespeare. By J. A. Fort (Oxford Univ. Press, American Branch, New York, 1924; pp. 47; $1.00). This little monograph begins by sketching the lives of Shakespeare and his patron Southampton, in order to give, in brief, the history of their friendship. Mr. Fort accepts the identification of Southampton with the "fair youth" to whom the first series of sonnets are addressed, and uses this identification as a basis for further argument. The two dated sonnets are Nos. 104 and 107. The former Mr. Fort dates at March or April, 1596 (p. 22); the latter, at November, 1598 (pp. 31 ff.). Proceeding from these fixed points, the author constructs a chronology for the sonnet series. He dates No. 1 at May, 1593, No. 126 at January or February, 1601. He now takes up the question of the authenticity of Thorpe's text, and concludes (pp. 38 ff.): "William Hall [Thorpe's Mr. W. H.], a bookseller's assistant, . . . brought copies of both series of Shakespeare's sonnets to Thorpe for publication. . . . I hold that in 1609 . . . either Southampton himself or a close friend of his, who had permission to act, secured [through Hall] the publication of these delightful poems." If so, it follows that the order of the sonnets, as Thorpe printed them, is authoritative. Mr. Fort's monograph concludes here, but he has added three appendices, the last of which is entitled "A speculation concerning the 'Dark Lady' sonnets." The title "speculation" might be applied to the whole monograph, since the evidence on which Mr. Fort's theories are built up is of the slightest, but the study is certainly an ingenious one, and gives every evidence of intimate acquaintance with the sonnets themselves—and after all, that is the best basis for any kind of scholarly activity.

K. M.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XL NOVEMBER, 1925 NUMBER 7

GIBBON EN HONGRIE: PREMIERES TRACES

(d'après des documents inédits)

On a étudié en 1916 l'action qu'a pu avoir Gibbon—assez tard—sur quelques écrivains hongrois, Teleki Lászlò, Szigligeti, Madàch, Jókai. Noms auxquels M. Fest Sàndor ajoutait, l'année suivante, comme indices de simple notoriété préalable, ceux de Dessewffy, Kazinczy, puis Döbrentei.[1] C'est le début de cette influence hongroise que l'on constatera ici, d'après des mémoires encore inédits, écrits en français par un Hongrois notoire qui mourut en 1803.

Plusieurs pages de ces Mémoires, rédigés à larges intervalles durant une retraite prolongée, semblent pouvoir se dater par la mention qui y est faite d'un événement, d'une publication. Il devrait en être de même de celles-ci. Mais l'auteur hongrois n'a connu Gibbon que par une traduction dont on ne sait quand elle commença de paraître. En sorte que son témoignage aiderait peut-être à la dater elle même, approximativement.

Publiée à Londres de 1776 à 1788, rééditée de 1788 à 1790, l'*History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* ne devait avoir qu'en 1824 sa traduction fragmentaire en hongrois. Malgré des relations anciennes entre calvinistes hongrois et protestants anglais, même des voyages de théologiens hongrois, transylvains surtout, jusqu'en Angleterre par la Hollande, et la constitution à Debrecen d'un centre d'influence théologique anglaise, l'éloignement, la difficulté des communications firent longtemps qu'en ce pays de bons traducteurs la littérature anglaise fut des

[1] M. Vértesy Jenö dans *Irodalomtörtenet:* Gibbon mint szépirôink forrása (p. 16-30).—Fest Sàndor, *Angol irodalmi Hatások hazánkban*, p. 95.

littératures étrangères la moins connue,—sauf, au dernier tiers du XVIIIe siècle, quelques œuvres de "docteurs anglais." Quelle qu'eût été à Vienne, vers la première moitié du règne de Joseph II, puis, par contact, au pays magyar, la vogue de l'Angleterre, modes, chevaux, *lads,* Anglais de passage à qui les dames de l'aristocratie viennoise ouvraient leurs cœurs "à deux battants,"[2] et quoique les traductions d'ouvrages anglais à Vienne eussent paru menacer alors l'influence littéraire de la France,[3] la pratique de l'anglais ne commença de se répandre en Hongrie qu'au premier quart du XIXe siècle. On l'enseignait à l'Université de Pest vers 1806. Mais, bien que quelques Hongrois lettrés aient voyagé en Angleterre, les deux Berzeviczy, les Eszterházy, Szechényi Ferenc et plus tard Szechényi István, les deux Teleki, Sándor István, et d'autres peut-être, les premiers écrivains de Hongrie sympathiques à l'Angleterre, même les membres de la Société Anglaise qui se fonde à Kassa, comme Bacsányi, Kazinczy, sont de bien médiocres anglicisants. Certains, comme Kis János, avaient pris une teinture d'anglais à l'Université hanovrienne de Goettingen, fondée par George III. C'est en Allemagne aussi que Döbrentei Gábor plus tard apprendra l'anglais. Mais il faut attendre la génération qui arrive à la vie littéraire vers 1820, pour voir un Vörösmarty lisant les poètes anglais dans le texte, un Kölcsey se mettant brusquement à l'anglais entre 1813 et 1815. Jusqu'alors on cite pour leur connaissance de l'anglais Péczeli Jozsef, qui semble avoir été le premier poète hongrois dans ce cas, ou Paláczi Horváth Adám.[4]

Il n'est donc pas étonnant que Gibbon soit entré en Hongrie par une voie détournée.

Son œuvre avait été mise en français dès 1777 (jusqu'à 1791) avec la collaboration du futur Louis XVI, assure-t-on; et Benjamin Constant aussi projeta de le traduire.[5] Il y eut une traduc-

[2] Fekete, *Esquisse d'un Tableau mouvant de Vienne* (1787), p. 43 et suiv.

[3] Fest Sándor, *Angol irodalmi Hardsok hazánkban* (1917), p. 12, 14, 34, cf. 4-10 pour la théologie. Cf. Marki Sándor, *Cromwell és Erdély* (Erdélyi Múzeum, 1901), p. 16 et suiv.

[4] Fest S., *ibid.*, p. 15: 45, 43, 10, 38, 80, 52. Cf. du même *Adalékok az angol nyelv térfoglalásához hazánkban 1848 elött*, dans Egyetemes Philologiai Közlöny de juin-décembre 1921, p. 128. Cf. Marczali Henrik, *Gróf Szechényi István és Anglia*, dans Magyar Figyelö, 1913, II, p. 161.

[5] G. Rudler, *Bibliographie critique de B. Constant*, p. 95.

tion allemande dès 1790. Mais le Hongrois que nous citerons n'a été initié à Gibbon par aucune de ces deux traductions. Il a connu la version italienne qui se publia sous le nom d'Angelo Fabroni, ancien précepteur des fils du grandduc de Toscane, *provveditore* de l'Université de Venise, polygraphe et savant en renom, qui avait voyagé en France et en Angleterre (1772), puis en Allemagne et en Autriche. Fabroni fit-il autre chose que diriger cette entreprise de librairie? On semble avoir vu d'assez mauvais œil, à Rome, selon le *Dizionario di Opere anonime e pseudonime di scrittori Italiani,* qu'un prélat s'occupât d'un travail semblable. Après sa mort (1803) ce qui restait de l'édition fut vendu au poids. Et c'est en 1823 seulement qu'une seconde traduction italienne de Gibbon verra le jour à Milan, non sans une *Confutazione* en règle de Spedalieri.

Nulle date n'est indiquée pour la publication de la version qui porte le nom de Fabroni. Le fait qu'elle semble être mentionnée la première en Hongrie, et non la traduction allemande ou la française, doit-il être interprété comme un indice qu'elle serait antérieure à l'une et à l'autre, à l'allemande en tout cas?

II

Notre auteur, le comte Jean Fekete de Galántha, a voyagé en Italie, séjourné en Autriche italienne, à Trieste notamment et par deux fois, connu Métastase à Vienne, traduit plusieurs chants de l'*Orlando furioso*. Il admirait la langue italienne, comme incomparablement plus propre à la musique, à l'opéra, que l'allemand ou même le français. Il semble l'avoir bien parlée, puisque, peu après la mort de Joseph II, c'est en italien qu'il adressa la parole à la reine.[6]

Mais il eût pu tout aussi bien lire Gibbon en français. Les seules œuvres qu'il ait imprimées, son *Esquisse d'un Tableau mouvant de Vienne* (1787) et ses deux volumes de *Rapsodies,* prose et vers (1781), sont en français, d'un français très passable. De même ses *Œuvres Posthumes* inédites, de même des lettres de lui au prince de Ligne, et d'autres, souvent mentionnées, à Voltaire, " Papa grand homme " comme il le nommait volontiers plus tard, qui ne dédaigna pas de lui répondre, à plusieurs reprises, de lui

[6] Kazinczy Ferenc, *Pályám Emlékezete*, pp. Abafi, III, 154.

corriger quelques vers, de lui envoyer ses œuvres, et fut pour lui non pas toutes les lettres françaises, mais la fleur des lettres françaises comme de l'esprit humain.

D'autre part, s'il préféra délibérément Voltaire et le français, s'il "nagea" dans la culture française, au dire du critique hongrois Riedl,[7] il sut l'allemand fort bien, comme ancien élève du *Theresianum* de Vienne, puis stagiaire aux Gardes du Corps, et officier de l'armée impériale. Volontiers il affecte de n'en avoir guère usé que pour du "baragouinage de service." Mais il traduit diverses choses allemandes, publie même à Dessau, en 1782, des *Bruchstücke* introuvables aujourd'hui, qui appellent une réponse allemande "Sur la perfectibilité de la Religion révélée." Il connut bien l'Allemagne, tout au moins l'Allemagne francisante de Wieland et de la tragédie fidèle aux *règles*. Et comme pendant à la spirituelle figure de Voltaire, la figure de son royal ami et correspondant français Frédéric II, "l'Unique," s'imposa toujours à l'admiration de Fekete János.

A ce bon polyglotte qui fut assez bon latiniste aussi, l'anglais pourtant manqua. Il était de la génération de Bessenyei, qui lisait les auteurs anglais en traductions françaises, de même que beaucoup de compatriotes, à Vienne ou Pest, en traductions allemandes. Il n'a guère cité Milton qu'à propos de Voltaire (bien qu'une lettre inédite le montre essayant de lire dans le texte le *Paradis perdu*),[8] ni le régulier Addison que pour l'opposer à Shakespeare, qu'il juge au patron de la tragédie française. Hobbes, qu'il lui arrive de nommer sur l'*homme* primitif, faisait depuis longtemps partie du domaine commun. Et quand il parle de Locke, c'est en notes à sa traduction manuscrite du poème *De la Loi Naturelle,* de Voltaire encore. Sur le tard, il fit grand cas de la constitution anglaise, par contraste aux horreurs de notre Révolution. Au regard de la pesanteur germanique, il eut alors de l'"estime" pour les Anglais "malgré leurs bizarreries." Et c'est un assez curieux indice de l'évolution des goûts littéraires nationaux, que de voir Fekete János conseiller à son fils, lorsqu'il semble se mettre à la poésie lui aussi, de lire Horace, Voltaire et les Anglais.[9]

[7] Article de 1904 dans Budapesti Szemle, tome 118, p. 140.

[8] Fekete János, *Magyar Munkái* (inédites), I, 169.

[9] Morvay (Győző), *Galántai Grof Fekete János*, Budapest (1903), p. 210.

Vers la même époque de sa vie, sans doute, son attention fut attirée par Gibbon. Et l'on se doute un peu de ce que ce Voltairien hongrois trouve de capital dans l'œuvre historique anglaise traduite sous la direction d'un *monsignore* italien.

III

Voici ce qui est dit de Gibbon aux "Petites Réflexions" (no. CIX) qui font la seconde partie des *Œuvres Posthumes* inédites du comte Fekete János. Quelques phrases sembleront un peu lourdes. Mais sauf des corrections légères d'orthographe ou de ponctuation, nous n'y changerons rien:

"De tout temps, les bigots ont cherché à jeter sur les génies supérieurs qui éclairaient de temps en temps ce monde qu'ils voulaient maintenir dans l'ignorance, un vernis d'incrédulité et même d'athéisme; ils ont rendu par là un très mauvais service à la religion, comme le remarque Papa Grand Homme au sujet des Encyclopédistes, puisqu'ils donnaient lieu de croire qu'on ne pouvait être un génie et la croire (la religion); le clergé d'Italie en a agi avec la même imprudence avec M. Gibbon, que l'Abbé Fabroni, cet ami du Philosophe couronné, de ce Léopold II mort trop tôt pour le bonheur du monde, a si élégamment et si exactement traduit. Ils n'ont rien eu de plus pressé que de réfuter, de calomnier cet Ecrivain si judicieux, cet émule de Tacite, qui n'a pas pu supprimer les vérités historiques moins favorables, surtout au Culte Catholique, mais qui en revanche peint si bien ce Julien, défiguré par ses panégyristes, ainsi que par les satires orthodoxes des Saints Pères. S'il lui rend justice comme soldat, comme Empereur, il ne cache pas sa pédantesque manie pour le Polythéisme, que Julien s'efforçait de rétablir sur les débris d'un culte au moins plus raisonnable, quand même il aurait déjà souffert quelques altérations, de son temps, de la primitive pureté de son modeste et divin fondateur.

"C'est Gibbon qui nous dévoile l'énigme d'un Empereur Philosophe, élevé au sein du Christianisme que l'initiation rend fanatique; qui dans l'instant où l'Hiérophante (supposé que les grands mystères se soient conservés sans tache jusqu'à cette époque) lui dévoile l'unité de Dieu, et l'explication hiéroglyphico-physique du Polythéisme, en devient l'énergumène; ce qui jeta sur les vrais

Philosophes de l'antiquité le soupçon d'Athéisme, si peu mérité (car ils n'étaient que Déistes dans l'acception la plus naturelle de ce mot) fut précisément ce qui rendit Julien fanatique d'une religion dont Socrate et ses disciples connaissaient si bien l'absurdité littérale.

"Comment peut-on concevoir que Julien, si grand quand il ne se piquait pas de faire le Théologien, qui se refusait aux miracles d' une Religion qui accompagna son berceau, ait cru au(x) prodiges, et plus absurdes et moins prouvés, du paganisme? qu'il ait eu foi aux augures, que tout imposteur à manteau philosophique ait trouvé accès à sa Cour somme à son cœur, qu'en un mot il se soit persuadé d'avoir commerce avec ces êtres d'un genre supérieur, auxquels le Polythéisme érigeait des autels? et tout cela est cependant vrai au pied de la lettre, est irrévocablement prouvé par ce Gibbon qu'on croit un ennemi acharné du Christianisme. Que Frédéric l'Unique le surpasse en tout (l'empereur Julien)! Plus grand général que Julien, l'émule de César en guerre, il l'était de Socrate en philosophie, et quelquefois d'Horace en poésie; puisse-t-il trouver un Gibbon pour écrire sa vie.

"C'est un bonheur pour ces pays, que les deux Cardinaux actuellement régnants ne lisent guère; car l'un d'eux surtout serait bien fait pour comprendre ce qu'il lit; certainement ils auraient mis Gibbon s'ils l'avaient connu, à la tête de ces livres dont ils défendent la publicité avec tant d'acharnement; il est vrai que Gibbon n'est pas une lecture de toilette, qu'il faut savoir penser pour le lire, que par conséquent il ne peut être dangereux chez nous que pour un très petit nombre de personnes, que les gens en place, surtout, sont à l'abri d'un poison trop subtil pour leurs organes matériels."

Que Gibbon n'ait pas été une "lecture de toilette," comme ce Chaulieu, fort prisé de Fekete,

> . . . . . dont les vers gracieux
> Des belles charmaient la toilette
> Ainsi que la table des Dieux,[10]

on en conviendra sans peine. Le mépris que notre auteur fait là de ses compatriotes incapable de "penser" n'a rien qui doive sur-

[10] Fekete János, *Mes Rapsodies*, I, 38.

prendre, d'un *philosophe* qui volontiers, parlant de la Diète où il jouera un rôle, s'y rangeait au parti sacrifié des *penseurs.*[11] Et jusqu'assez tard, par admiration pour des natures plus cultivées, pour la France de Voltaire surtout, il a parlé sans indulgence de sa "pauvre patrie, . . . sale et barbare," à la renaissance littéraire de laquelle pourtant il contribuera de son mieux, avant sa fin; de ce "pays affreux,

> Que l'ignorance et la pédanterie
> S'entredisputent tous les jours";

comme des "lourds Allemands" d'Autriche, et de la "ville ignare" qu'était Vienne, "peu fertile en talents," où on lit peu, l'on pense peu, où le peuple est "engourdi dans une épaisse balourdise." . . .

Un bibliothécaire du Nemzeti Múzeum de Budapest a bien voulu consulter pour moi les *schematismi* des diocèses hongrois: ils indiquent pour cette époque un seul cardinal hongrois, celui de Gran ou Esztergom, qui de 1776 à 1799 fut le comte Joseph Batthyány: Fekete a fait, en vers, grand éloge de son libéralisme. Faut-il donc entendre, par les deux prélats si peu curieux d'esprit de "ces malheureux pays," un cardinal autrichien aussi bien qu'un hongrois?

Peu importe en somme, non plus que de savoir jusqu'à quel point l'abbé Fabroni fut l' "ami" du Philosophe Couronné dont il avait eu les enfants comme élèves en Toscane. La lecture du *Gibbon* de Fabroni est simplement, pour Fekete, matière à reprendre la série de ses variations sur un thème familier, auquel il se tint à peu près toute sa vie, un thème voltairien.

Comme lancé par Gibbon, notre auteur continue de plus belle (no. CX): "La Bigotterie est un torrent grossi par l'avarice et l'envie de dominer sacerdotales; dès qu'elle parvient à rompre les digues que le bon sens lui oppose, elle se déborde et devient dangereuse aux états qui ont eu la faiblesse de laisser percer cette digue; elle n'est point fille de la Religion, mais bien de la superstition; car la sœur aînée de la saine Philosophie, qui descendit avec elle du ciel pour consoler, pour apprivoiser l'homme brut, ne saurait avoir produit un monstre qui sape l'autel, l'ordre civil et

[11] Id., *Œuvres Posthumes* inédites, *Petites Réflexions*, no. XL.

moral, ainsi que tout pouvoir légitime; c'est les pilliers de la bigoterie judaïque, ces infâmes pharisiens, ces indignes descendants du frère de Moïse, qui furent les ennemis les plus acharnés de Jésus-Christ; c'est leurs imitateurs qui le crucifient encore chaque jour, en infectant ses dogmes sacrés de l'alliage impur de leur fanatisme; quand viendra-t-il, ce temps heureux où les deux sœurs célestes, entrelaçant leurs bras, pourront concourir ensemble à élaguer les maux innombrables du meilleur des mondes possibles? quand verra-t-on le Christianisme épuré, qui n'est que la plus sublime philosophie, régner sans partage sur l'univers éclairé par le flambeau de sa sœur?" . . . .

Au début de ses *Œuvres Posthumes,* il invoque ainsi Jésus:

> "Philosophe sans fard! Déiste vertueux!
> Fléau de l'Hypocrite! appui du malheureux!
> Plus grand que Confuzé, plus sage que Socrate,
> C'est en tes actions que ta morale éclate. . . .
> Portant de rudes coups au cruel Judaïsme,
> Tu fis évanouir l'absurde Paganisme. . . .
> Sans préjugé, j'admire en toi l'homme et le sage. . . .
> Le Prêtre et le Lévite ont conspiré la mort:
> T'invoquant, à tout sage ils font le même sort."

Pour ce médiocre poète et ce *philosophe* convaincu, le "christianisme épuré" auquel il se dit "revenu par conviction" se concilie fort bien avec la haine pour l' "envie de dominer sacerdotale" qui fut, comme on sait, dès avant la publication du *Dictionnaire Philosophique,* une sorte de mot d'ordre voltairien: plus d'une lettre à Frédéric II, à d'Alembert, à Damilaville, en témoignerait. Avec la haine des "préjugés" aussi: en "esprit-fort de bonne foi," Fekete leur avait une fois pour toutes déclaré la guerre, comme aux "bigots timorés," aux bigots de toutes Eglises, nombreuses en Hongrie, "soit Catholique Romaine, soit Orientale, soit Réformée, soit Protestante." Enfin, avec la haine du "cruel fanatisme," dont la Philosophie seule "émousse le poignard," dont les ennemis sont ses héros, et que l'âge ne lui fait point paraître moins "dégoûtant." [12]

Le *Mahomet* de Voltaire avait pour titre exact: "le Fanatisme, ou Mahomet le Prophète." La fin de l'*Histoire de Jenni,* par

[12] Fekete János, *Œuvres Posthumes* inédites, *Petites Réflexions,* XXVII.

exemple, montrait dans l'athéisme et le fanatisme "les deux pôles d'un monde de confusion et d'horreur. La petite zône de la vertu est entre ces deux pôles. . . ." Et dans une autre pièce de vers, *Sur l'Egypte,* le voltairien Fekete Jånos voit retrouvé déjà, grâce aux monuments égyptiens,

> Le fil interrompu par tant de charlatans . . .
> C'est le déchiffrement de tes hiéroglyphes
> Qui de tout fanatisme allait rogner les griffes. . . .

Et l'on sait par l'ouvrage de M. Marczali Henrik, sur la diète hongroise de 1790-91, qu'on y discuta souvent, avec passion, des méfaits du fanatisme.[13] Or Fekete en fut, et dut alors croire l'heure venue pour lui de jouer enfin le rôle auquel s'était dérobée une vie militaire assez morne et prématurément brisée. Il y fit presque figure d'un Mirabeau, nous dit-on: pour d'autres, d'un novateur dangereux, d'une sorte de révolutionnaire suspect.

Ne fut-il pas, au moins autant, question du fanatisme à la Loge "Harmonie et Concorde Universelle" à Trieste? Dès 1784 un Fekete "vieux maçon" y tient des discours en français, les réunit en une brochure vendue un florin au bénéfice d'une famille pauvre, à qui devait aller aussi le produit des travaux littéraires antérieurs de l'auteur. Quoi qu'en ait pensé l'historien de la maçonnerie en Autriche-Hongrie, M. Abafi,[14] ce Fekete ne pouvait guère être l'ancien vice-chancelier de Hongroie, le père du nôtre. Et l'on sait d'autre part que Fekete Jånos était en 1784 à Trieste et dans la région. Il y est revenu plus tard; mêlé à la conjuration de Hompesch il avait jugé bon de s'éloigner quelque peu des capitales. C'est à Trieste qu'il apprit la mort de Joseph II (1790). Ne serait-ce pas là aussi qu'il connut cette traduction de Gibbon par Fabroni, à l'endroit de laquelle le clergé d'Italie agissait avec tant d' "imprudence"?

IV

Le texte que nous avons reproduit mentionne la mort de Léopold II. Il daterait donc au plus tôt de 1792, puisque ce prince,

[13] Marczali Henrik, *Az 1790-91-dik országgyülés*, II, 249 et suiv.

[14] Abafi, *Geschichte der Freimaurerei in Œsterreich-Ungarn* (Bud. 1890-99), IV, 375.—Morvay Győző, dans *Irodalom Történeti Közlemények*, 1901, p. 51.

grand-duc de Toscane dès sa dix-huitième année et durant vingt-cinq ans (1765-1790) mourut deux ans après avoir remplacé son frère Joseph II sur le trône impérial. "Trop tôt pour le bonheur du monde," dit ici Fekete. Ailleurs, en termes moins enthousiastes, il écrit de lui: "s'il n'a pas fait les grandes choses qu'on espérait de lui, au moins n'a-t-il rien gâté." [15]

Il semble ne faire état ici que de quelques chapitres de Gibbon, surtout des XXIIe et XXIIIe, où il est question de la religion de Julien, de son fanatisme, de sa dissimulation en matière de foi, de son initiation aux mystères éleusiniens à Ephèse, de son enthousiasme et de ses jeûnes, de ses dix années de ruse jusqu'au début de la guerre civile, où il se déclara tout à coup l'implacable ennemi du christianisme. En quoi Gibbon ne faisait guère que rappeler à Fekete Voltaire encore: Julien n'est-il pas, selon M. Ernest Dupuy, l'un des saints laïques les plus honorés au *Dictionnaire Philosophique?* [16]

Mais dans un passage antérieur du même recueil manuscrit il était déjà question de Gibbon, à peu près du même ton (no. XCIII):

"On s'acharne, à nouveaux frais, à décrier la sainte Philosophie, cette sœur jumelle de la Religion, et l'on ne réfléchit pas que, malgré tout ce que l'on nous dit des horreurs de la dépravation de ce siècle, auquel on fait l'honneur de l'appeler Philosophique, le monde valait encore moins lorsqu'il était ignorant; dans ces temps barbares qui ont suivi la destruction de l'Empire Romain, il s'est commis mille et mille fois plus de crimes, le sang humain a coulé avec bien plus d'abondance, que dans telle autre époque, d'une culture plus ou moins avancée: on n'a qu'à lire Gibbon pour s'en convaincre."

Et il continuait (no. XCIV): "Il n'y a que ceux qui y gagnent, qui voudraient maintenir ou rejeter les peuples dans l'ignorance; enfants des ténèbres, ils craignent la lumière, bien persuadés de ne pouvoir pêcher qu'en eau trouble. Mais leurs efforts seront vains, les étincelles de lumière répandues sur la surface du globe que nous habitons ont pris de trop fortes racines, une certaine lueur de clarté s'est si visiblement étendue sur les deux mondes, que je

[15] Fekete Jânos, *Œuvres Posthumes* inédites, *Petites Réflexions*, no. XL.

[16] Ernest Dupuy, *A. de Vigny, L'Homme et l'Œuvre*, p. 169.

crois à peine le Kamschadale aussi abruti que l'était l'Europe il y a deux siècles . . ." Un autre ouvrage de lui parlait déjà de "l'usage digne des Kamschadales" qui préside aux mariages des jeunes filles nobles de Vienne.[17]

Si la langue semble ici moins sûre, la foi en des "étincelles de lumière" qui auraient pris racine au travers des deux mondes n'est pas moins confiante, ni, en somme, moins généreuse. Gibbon sert décidément d'appoint à la lutte contre l'obscurantisme. Fekete n'écrivait-il pas de même à son fils, avant de lui parler d'Helvétius:

"Vous savez que les étincelles que votre esprit a jetées de temps en temps, en me pénétrant de joie, n'ont servi qu'à fortifier en moi le désir de vous associer aux travaux sacrés de la saine Philosophie, qui, répandue sur l'univers entier, forme une association tacite pour le progrès de la lumière"?[18]

Un autre passage oppose à la vraie religion chrétienne selon Jésus, "si pure, si simple, et par là si céleste," las communions actuelles "qui se combattent sans s'entendre" (no. CVIII):

"A peine mourut-il, qu'on vit le Platonisme de l'école d'Alexandrie, déjà si dégénéré lui-même, infecter ses dogmes et fournir matière à ces disputes interminables qui occupèrent la fainéantise oiseuse des moines d'Orient; ces pieux solitaires se lassèrent bientôt de ne travailler qu'à des métiers utiles, ils s'occupèrent de ce qu'ils n'entendaient pas plus que nous, et tout en voulant éclaircir des mystères inconcevables, cimentèrent le germe d'un tas d'hérésies, aussi ridicules les unes que les autres, et souvent trés dangereuses par l'influence qu'elles eurent sur le système politique des empires. Quand Mahomet II prit Constantinople, cette Capitale disputait Théologie, au lieu de ce battre sur les remparts."

Or Gibbon a conté, au chapitre LXVIII de son *Decline and Fall*, le siège de Constantinople en 1453 par les 20.000 hommes de Mahomet II, sa défense héroïque, du 5 avril au 29 mai, par l'empereur Constantin Dragascès avec une garnison moindre de moitié, l'assaut général, les Turcs, repoussés partout, reussissant à surprendre une porte, Constantin trouvé mort sous un monceau de cadavres, et le carnage de la population civile qui, au lieu de contribuer à la défense, attendait avec confiance l'arrivée d'un ange protecteur. . . . .

[17] Fekete János, *Esquisse d'un Tableau Mouvant de Vienne*, p. 55.

[18] Id., *Œuvres Posthumes*, inédites, A mon Fils, p. 39.

D'autre part, des lettres de Fekete János à son ami l'écrivain Aranka, transcrites au recueil de ses *Œuvres magyares* inédites, nomment plus d' une fois Gibbon, citent même ses *Mémoires*, relèvent qu'il a, comme Tacite, l'accent de la justice. Ses *Petites Réflexions*, on l'a vu, l'appelaient un "émule de Tacite." Fekete fils avait entrepris de traduire Gibbon. Quant au père, il ne parle de rien moins que de retracer à la manière de Gibbon la plus grande infortune de l'histoire hongroise, le désastre de Mohács.[19]

L'admiration, la foi commune, ont seules de ces audaces. De ce hardi projet nous n'avons qu'une ébauche.[20] Et peut-être cela vaut-il mieux. Le cas de Fekete János disciple tardif de Gibbon peut cependant servir de preuve que d'une littérature à une autre, les influences ne perdent rien de leur force à être accidentelles parfois et souvent indirectes.

HENRI TRONCHON.

Université de Strasbourg.

ON ALLEGORY IN *THE TEMPEST*

An interesting case of how the allegorizers of Shakspere refuse to give him credit for common sense and an elementary knowledge of practical play-writing occurs, I think, in Mr. Colin Still's recent Shakespeare's Mystery Play (1921). In the course of a lengthy comparison of the details of *The Tempest* with the ancient "mystery" or initiation, he pronounces it remarkable that the costumes of Gonzalo and other members of the court are not soiled by the water into which they are cast by Prospero's magic. "In view of this explicit statement," writes Mr. Still (p. 18), "that these men plunged into the water, an especial importance must attach to the fact that Gonzalo, after landing upon the Island, calls atten-

[19] Id., *Magyar Munkái* inédites, II, 99, 159, 147, 92.

[20] Ce fragment historique de *Magyarok Törtėnete* (aux *Magyar Munkái* inédites, II, 131, cf. 141) devait être l'histoire de la Hongrie jusqu'à Mohács. La dissolution de la Société Transylvaine Hongroise, *Erdélyi Magyar Nyelvmivelö Társaság*, empêcha l'impression et déjà l'achèvement de l'œuvre historique de Fekete. Voir à ce sujet Morvay G., *Galántai Gróf Fekete János*, p. 202-205, et Krasso Jolán, *Galántai Gróf Fekete János Magyar Munkáji*, p. 32.

tion no less than four times to the unblemished condition of his clothes. The Poet seems to be emphasizing some highly significant circumstance." "The fact is," continues Mr. Still (p. 19), "the immersion in the water is not understood in a strictly physical sense. Like baptism in the Christian Church and the 'washings' in the pagan rites, it is represented as a physical occurrence; but its significance is entirely subjective."

That Shakspere should follow the remark of Ariel (I, ii, 218-9) that the garments of the nobles are unimpaired by the sea water with Gonzalo's fourfold insistence (II, i, 61-4; 68-70; 96-8; 102-3) that they show no signs of a ducking certainly indicates in no uncertain manner that the dramatist is "emphasizing some highly significant circumstance." This is especially so in view of the fact that in the same play the mariners enter wet (I, i, 52) and Caliban, Stephano and Trinculo enter "all wet" (IV, i). Instead of finding subtle symbolism in the occurrence, however, let us see if Shakspere's curious insistence that the salt water freshened rather than soiled the garments of his nobles can not be more plausibly explained on grounds entirely compatible with practical play-writing. In other words, is not the dramatist resorting to this repetition of an apparently minor detail in order to protect himself against the ridicule which may well have originated in a critical audience in consequence of the absurd situation resulting from the presence in *The Tempest* of two conflicting conventions of the Elizabethan theater—the drenching of actors for the purpose of stage realism and the costuming of noble characters in costly and delicate garments not only to satisfy the vanity of individual players but for the purposes of stage decoration and the protection to actors forced to perform in closest proximity to richly bedecked gallants? A Mr. Bartley is reported to have been fond of saying to Planché: "Sir, you must tell them you are going to do so and so, you must then tell them you are doing it, then that you have done it; and then, perhaps, they will understand you." The same compliment to an audience has been attributed to a contemporary dramatist, while Henry Ward Beecher and an eminent American scholar have been credited with a very similar comment regarding visitors to sermons and readers of articles in the so-called learned journals; and whereas Shakspere has nowhere expressed himself in such language, it is

reasonable to suppose that he understood the vital necessity of absolute clearness in certain dramatic details and consequently in *The Tempest* has taken pains to clarify—and by so doing artistically justify—an obvious absurdity at the risk of being somewhat repetitious.

Now for evidence illustrating the stage conventions referred to above. The practice of drenching actors for realistic effect can be abundantly illustrated. Low or comic characters were frequently subjected to a species of wetting more disagreeable than that administered to Trinculo and his fellows in *The Tempest* or the Horsecourser in *Dr. Faustus*. In *Blurt, Master Constable* (IV, i), for instance, Curvetto pulls a cord hanging from a window and is "drenched with water"; the lecherous courtier in Nabbes's *Totenham-Court* (III, v), while hiding in a tub, is drenched by a maid servant with a "paile of conduit water"; more realistic than anything in the movies is the emptying of the "chamber-pot" on Crackstone's head in *The Two Italian Gentlemen* (l. 1422); and in Jordan's *Tricks of Youth* Sir Reference inflicts an even greater indignity upon the drunken Pimpwell (IV, ii). Not only were the garments of lowly characters dampened for the amusement of the audience, but leading characters in serious plays frequently appeared in a similar condition. At the beginning of II, i of Heywood's *Captives*, to illustrate, Palaestra enters "all wett as newly shipwrecke"; Pericles appears "wet" (II, i); while in the dumb show near the beginning of Heywood's *Four Prentices of London* Godfrey appears "as newly landed and halfe naked," Grey comes in "all wet," and Charles enters "all wet with his sword." It is apparently to such realism that Jasper Mayne refers in his poem on Ben Jonson:

> Thine were land-tragedies, no prince was found
> To swim a whole scene out, then o' the stage drowned.

That Shakspere in a play which was certainly not a "land-tragedy" should have done a deal of explaining why the garments of his nobles were not water-soaked when stage realism demanded that they be so provided is pretty obvious. The play demanded that Ferdinand and his fellows be garbed in showy and expensive clothes; and since there was neither time nor opportunity for a convincing change of costume, the dramatist did not see fit to

subject expensive garments to a wetting or give to his noble personages a bedraggled aspect. Indeed, there is an especial reason why this particular play should have demanded costumes whose original "freshness and glosses" had been "newdyes" by magic waters. In its present form the play contains abundant evidence of having been acted at court; and at court realism in costume was frankly sacrificed for richness and beauty. Perhaps the most striking indication of this court convention is found in the speech of the Boy which precedes the prologue of Hausted's *Rivall Friends*, acted at Cambridge on March 19, 1631:

> "Yee must suppose the Scene too to be here in England at a country village. Some low homely slight stuffe 'twill be, I doubt . . . And here's an other dainty absurdity too (which I care not much if I tell yee) concerning their cloathes, which as far transcend the condition of the persons, as the court does the country. But that they hope the Court will excuse, for had it not bin here, they had bin forc'd (they say) to keepe the true *decorum*."

Anyone who may be interested in other instances where "decorum" was similarly sacrificed at court will find an abundance of material in Feuillerat's *Documents of the Revels*, Reyher's *Les Masques Anglais*, and Simpson and Bell's *Designs by Inigo Jones for Masques and Plays at Court*.

THORNTON S. GRAVES.

University of North Carolina.

OLD SAXON NOTES

1) *ÊNHARD*

Uuarð thar êosago
an morgantîd manag gisamnod
irri endi *ênhard* inuuideas gern,
uurðes uuillean.

(*Hêliand* 5060)

What does the adjective *ênhard* mean here? Behagel in his edition of the *Hêliand* (1910) gives it as "sehr hart, sehr böse"; whereas Piper in his edition (1897) in a foot-note gives it as "fest auf sich selbst stehend, entschlossen, mutig."

In the first place, the adjective *-hard*, as the context shows, is here used in a pejorative sense, i. e., not 'brave,' 'determined [to do something praiseworthy]' but 'hard,' 'evil,' as in [*gêl*]*-hert* 'insolent' or [*gram*]*-hard* 'hostile.' Piper's 'entschlossen,' 'mutig' is, therefore, entirely misleading.

In the second place, the word *ên-* in OS., as the first element of a compound, is usually confined to one of two senses, viz., either 'one,' 'alone,' as in *ên-fald* 'one-fold' > 'unmixed,' 'true,' etc., *ên-koro* 'alone,' 'lonely,' *ên-ôdi* 'solitude,' 'desert,' etc. or 'at one,' 'together,' as in *ên-wald* 'of one power,' 'agreed,' 'in harmony,' *ên-wordi* 'one in word,' 'agreed.'

I believe that *ên-* in the adjective *ên-hard* either has the intensive force of 'altogether,' i. e., 'altogether, entirely evil, hard' (= Behagel's 'sehr hart,' 'sehr böse') or denotes the idea of 'at one,' 'agreed,' i. e., 'agreed upon doing evil.' The context gives us no clue in this regard; the scribes were thoroly *wicked* and at the same time *agreed* in their determination *to do evil* to Jesus, *i. e.,* to destroy him.

But there is apparently a third sense of *ên-* in OS., *viz.,* 'one's self,' 'self,' which occurs in the adjective *ên-strîdig* 'stubborn,' 'eigensinnig,' lit. 'striving for one's self,' 'striving to have one's own way.' This sense of **ain-*, as the first element of a compound, is especially frequent in ON.; with OS. *ên-strîdig* 'stubborn' compare ON. *ein-ráðr* 'stubborn' 'self-willed,' lit. 'controlling for one's self,' and ON. *ein-vili* 'self-willed,' lit. 'wanting for one's self.' In all these cases *ein-* has reference to the person in question; hence the idea of 'self.'

Possibly it is this sense of *ên-* in OS. which Piper had in mind when he rendered the adjective *ên-hard* by 'fest auf sich selbst stehend.' But the pejorative sense of the adjective in our passage would exclude this meaning, *i. e.,* 'self-reliant,' 'firm,' which denotes a good quality. This meaning belongs to ON. *ein-arðr* (**ein-harðr*) 'firm,' 'steadfast' rather than to OS. *ên-hard.*

In conclusion it is interesting to note that the word *ên-* in OS. is never prefixed to an adjective having a laudatory or a good sense. In this case the intensive prefix is always *ala-*: *alo-* 'all'; cf. *ala-hwît* 'all white,' *ala-jung* 'very young,' *alo-hêl* 'all whole,' 'sound,' *alo-mahtig* 'almighty,' etc., but *ên-hard* 'only evil,' 'entirely evil.'

2) *FELGIAN* '*To Cover With Something,*' '*Heap Upon*'

OS. *felgian:* OHG. *felgen* < **falg-jan,* but with what root is this stem **falg-* connected? I take the stem **falg-* to be the *Hochstufe* of the 3rd. ablaut series represented by the strong verb OS. *felhan, falh: fulhum, -folhan* 'to bury.' WGerm. **falg-jan* meant then 'to cause to be buried,' from which the senses both of the OS. verb *felgian* 'to cover [with something]' and of the OHG. verb *felgen* 1) 'impute to' (*beilegen*); 2) 'arrogate to one's self,' 'claim' (*für sich etwas beanspruchen*) may readily be derived.

The OS. verb preserves the primary sense of the verb **falg-jan, i. e.,* 'to cause to be buried' > 'to cover'; from this sense of 'to cover' we have in OHG. first the sense of 'put upon,' 'attach to' and then finally from the sense of 'attach to' is developed the sense of 'impute,' 'lay claim to'; what has been 'attached to' one may be 'claimed' as belonging to one. For a similar semantic development 'bury,' 'hide,' 'cover' > 'attach to,' 'give to' compare Gothic [*ga*]-*filhan* 'hide,' 'bury': *ana-filhan* 'give over' 'entrust,' OS.-OHG. *bi-felhan* 'hide,' 'bury' > 'give over to,' 'entrust.'

The root **falg-,*[1] so far as I know, has not heretofore been connected with the verb *felhan;* it is not listed by Fick (*Vgl. Wörterb. der indogerm. Sprachen*[4], p. 237) under the root *felh-, falh-, fulg-,* etc. But I think it is clear that both the form and the meaning of OS. *felgian* support my etymology, and OHG. *felgen* can hardly be separated from OS. *felgian.*

3) *MANGON* '*To Do Business,*' '*Traffic*'

OS. *mang-on* 'to traffic,' 'do business': OE. [*ge*]-*mang-ian* 'to gain by traffic' < **mang-ôn.* The primary sense of this stem **mang-*[2] is 'mix'; cf. OS. *gi-mang:* OE. *ge-mang* 'mixing,'

[1] The root **felh-* 'bury,' 'hide,' I believe also appears in the ON. adjective *fjálgr* 'safe,' 'well kept'; *i. e.,* **felg-o-s* with accent in the Indo-European on the end syllable > **felg-a-R* > *fjalgr* with later lengthening of the vowel *a* before *l* + a consonant *fjálgr;* but this word is not listed by Fick under *felh-*, p. 237. The idea of 'safe,' 'well kept' may easily be derived from the primary sense of 'to hide,' cf. Germ. *wohl geborgen,* 'safe and sound,' *bergen* 'to hide.'

[2] For the root **mang-* see Fick, *Vgl. Wörterb. der indogerm. Sprachen*[4], sub (*meng*) 2., *mangian,* p. 309.

'crowd [of people]'; **mang-jan* > OS. *mengian*, MHG.-NHG. *mengen* 'to mix.'

In OE. the substantive *ge-mang* is already found in the sense of 'business,' 'traffic.' The semantic development is 'mixing,' 'crowd of people' > 'business, traffic in a place (*i. e.*, the market) where people congregate': hence the denominative verbs OE. *ge-mangian* 'to gain by traffic': OS. *mangon* 'to traffic,' 'do business.'

An interesting semantic parallel to the denominative verbs OE. *ge-mangian*: OS. *mangon* (from a substantive stem **mang-ô*, cf. *ge-mang* 'a crowd of people') is offered by Greek ἀγορά : ἀγοράζειν. The substantive ἀγορά is derived from the stem ἀγ- (as in ἄγ-ειν) 'drive together,' 'assemble'; ἀγορά = 'meeting place,' 'public forum' > 'market place' > 'market,' cf. ἀγορὰν παρέχειν 'to hold a market'; from this latter sense of ἀγορά (= 'market') we have the denominative verb ἀγορά-ζειν 'to traffic,' 'do business.'

4) *Regarding the Instrumental Genitive*

The genitive case is often used in the *Hêliand* with an instrumental function; thus 2622M *biliðeo sagda* "He told *by means of parables*," 5943 *he iru selðo gibôd torohtero têcno* "He himself commanded her *by bright signs*." Sometimes such a genitive is used parallel with the instrumental case; cf. 2719,

andrêd that he thene uueroldcuning
sprâcono gespôni endi spâhun uuordun

"She feared that he would urge the king *by speeches* and *by wise words*."

This use of the genitive case is only one phase of that category which Holthausen (*As. Grm*[2]., § 487, 1, 2) designates as "ein freierer Genitiv"[3] (i. e., a looser use of the genitive). The genitive case here denotes an adverbial usage, *i. e.*, *in what way*, from which was developed the specific function of instrumentality, *i. e.*, *by what means*.

This looser (adverbial) use of the genitive occurs quite frequently in ON. (cf. Nygaard, *Norrøn Syntax*, 1905, § 142, "Enkeltstaaende anvendelser"). As an interesting parallel in ON. to this *instru-*

[3] Cf. also Behagel, *Syntax des Heliand*, p. 171, § 271.

mental function of the adverbial genitive I may refer to the phrase, often occurring in the *Elder Edda,*[4] *þegi þú þeira orða* (*þrymskv.*, 17, *Guðrunkv.*, I, 23, etc.) "Be silent *with those words*"; cf. this phrase with the OS. *biliðeo sagda* (*Hêliand* 2622M) "He told in (*i. e.*, with) parables."

5) *HE NIATE OF HE MÔTI*

Uuita kiasan im ôðrana
niudsamna namon: *he niate of he môti*
(*Hêliand* 224)

What is the significance of this expression *he niate of he môti?* Piper in his edition of the *Hêliand* (1897) translates it by "Er geniesse (ihn, den Namen), wenn er in der Lage (dazu) ist." I should rather translate: "Er geniesse ihn, wenn *es ihm beschieden ist*," "Let him enjoy it, if he may (*i. e.*, if this privilege be granted him by Fate)." Piper's rendering "wenn er in der Lage dazu ist," "if he is in a position to," "if he can," seems to me to be out of keeping with the situation involved. What does the phrase "in der Lage dazu" really mean in this connection?

To my mind the passage can convey sense only when we regard the phrase *he niate of he môti* as an old epic formula. The verb *môti* denotes a hypothetical future idea; *i. e.*, "if he may," "if it be his lot." The future was, according to the Old Germanic religion, in the hands of Fate, and I believe that our passage contains this idea as regards the ceremony of name-giving.

We know from the *Helgakviða* I of the ON. *Poetic Edda* that the Norns directed the whole course of the child's life at birth. Now, our passage is wholly original on the part of the poet; there is nothing corresponding to it in *Tatian* IV, 11 (Luke, 1, 61). This fact proves clearly enough that the phrase *he niate of he môti* represents a purely Germanic conception. It is reasonable to assume that the ceremony of name-giving to the child was connected with the notion of Fate, *i. e.*, that the child's name was supposed to be included in his future success or happiness, all of which was determined at its birth. The phrase *he niate of he môti* evidently means then: "Let him enjoy (*i. e.*, have good from) his name, if Fate so decrees."

[4] The numbering of the ON. reference to the *Elder Edda* is based upon the Hildebrand-Gering edition[4], 1922.

In support ofl the assumption that this phrase is an Old Germanic epic formula I need only to refer to the *Hildebrandslied* 60, where Hiltibrant says: *niuse dê môtti* "Let him enjoy [the victory], who may (*i. e.*, to whom Fate may give the victory)."

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT.

University of Kansas.

NOTE ON *KING LEAR*

> Men must endure
> Their going hence, even as their coming hither;
> Ripeness is all. (v. 2, 9-11)

Read apart from their context these lines seem to admit of but one interpretation; indeed their meaning seems so obvious that the commentators, finding no ground for discussion, have passed them by almost without notice. Their apparent purpose would seem to preach resignation to "the inevitable end"; to reiterate the old, if rather obvious, truth, that even as we submit to birth (having, indeed, no choice in the matter), so we must submit to death likewise, when the full time shall come. Furness quotes Stevens,—who bids us compare *Hamlet,* v. 2, 210, "the readiness is all,"—and Wordsworth, who takes "readiness" and "ripeness" in the sense of spiritually fit to die.[1] Furness also refers to Birch, who sees in "ripeness" "nothing but materialism": a likening of "man to fruit which must fall."[2] But, in spite of minor differences, all seem to accept the most obvious meaning of the passage without question, and there is a general disposition, shared by the late Professor R. M. Alden, to assume that the passages in *Lear* and *Hamlet* are expressions of the same thought. Indeed, in quoting the two passages Professor Alden italicizes "ripeness is all" and "the readiness is all,"[3] to emphasize the closeness of the parallel between the two nearly identical phrases.

The odds seem greatly in favor of this natural interpretation, supported as it seems to be by such a weight of authority, and yet

[1] *On Shakespeare's Knowledge and Use of the Bible*, pp. 245-6.

[2] *An Inquiry into the Philosophy and Religion of Shakespeare*, pp. 424-5.

[3] Alden's *Shakespeare,* pp. 338-9.

I have long been troubled with doubts as to its correctness. I cannot but feel, moreover, that the implied similarity between the associated passages is largely verbal and superficial, and that we are insensibly led by their conjunction to miss the real significance of the passage in Lear. On the other hand there may be difficulties in the way of our adopting another interpretation which seems, from one aspect, distinctly preferable. Under the circumstances, it seems better to submit the case to the judgment of the Court.

My difficulty is that if we take the words in their ordinary and natural sense, we render them utterly inappropriate to the situation which calls them forth. It will be remembered that they are spoken by Edgar to Gloster, after the rout of the King's forces by Edmund. In the early part of the scene, Edgar has left the helpless Gloster in a place of comparative safety near the battlefield, promising to return if he survives the fight. Edgar rushes back to his father and tells him that all is lost. Gloster knows that he can end his life simply by remaining, and he chooses to remain and die. He answers Edgar's hurried words, "give me thy hand, come on," with a flat refusal:

> No further, sir; a man may rot even here.

The situation in a former scene is thus strikingly repeated. Once before Gloster has tried to end his life and has been saved from self-destruction by Edgar. And in the past Edgar has done more than save his father from death, he has been instrumental in changing Gloster's whole attitude toward suicide. When Gloster throws himself, as he imagines, from the cliff, he is at first bitterly rebellious when he finds that he still lives:—

> Is wretchedness depriv'd that benefit,
> To end itself by death? 'Twas yet some comfort,
> When misery could beguile the tyrant's rage,
> And frustrate his proud will. (IV. 6, 61)

But Edgar persuades him that the gods have miraculously preserved him, and Gloster comes to believe that his life is not his to fling away at pleasure when the burden grows too heavy, but a gift of the gods to be accepted and endured until they themselves shall give the signal for release. He accordingly tells Edgar:

> henceforth I'll bear (i. e. endure)
> Affliction, till it do cry out itself
> Enough, enough, and die. (IV. 6, 75)

A little later he shows even more clearly that he has learned the lesson of endurance which Edgar has helped to teach him:

> You ever gentle gods, take my breath from me;
> Let not my worser spirit tempt me again
> To die before you please! (IV. 6, 214)

In the scene we are considering Gloster's "worser spirit" *does* return to tempt him and to triumph over his good resolutions. Once more, forgetful of the past, he yields to the temptation to die by his own act. Hence Edgar first stirs his recollection of all that has gone before with the reminder—"What, in ill thoughts *again?*" and then goes on to combat those "ill thoughts" in the passage under discussion. Now it is surely incredible that Edgar should choose this breathless and critical moment to assure his father that all men must die. His object is to save him; he is not telling him that he must "endure" death, but that, longing to die, he must be patient to endure life. It seems evident that Gloster himself understands Edgar's words in this sense, for he abandons his idea of inviting death by remaining. He admits the truth of Edgar's words (v. 2, 11) and then accepts the chances of prolonging his life and suffers himself to be led away.

This then is certainly what the passage should mean, read in the light of its context, but will the words themselves admit of such an interpretation?

The matter turns first upon the meaning we attach to the word "endure," and secondarily upon the emphasis we lay on the phrase "even as" and the significance we give to "ripeness." Endure may be taken in two ways. If we were justified in supposing that some such word as "unto" or "until" was to be understood after "endure," we should get the meaning which all that has gone before has led us to expect:—men must patiently endure unto death even as they wait for birth. But I can find no entirely satisfactory precedent for such a use of "endure," and I am not competent to say whether it is allowable.

If however, we reject this construction of "endure" we may get the same meaning from the passage and yet take "endure" in

the more usual sense. Edgar may mean that we must endure (*i. e.* bear, or submit to) death precisely as we endure birth, *if we are to obey the moral law.* The compulsion, that is, is not actual but moral, for in the world of fact the analogy between our "going hence" and our "coming hither" is not perfect. Man cannot choose when his life shall begin, he has the power to end it before the gods or Nature shall decree. Thus, while he can defeat the will of the gods by anticipating the hour of his "going hence," he should, according to the moral law, submit to death *precisely* as he has unconsciously submitted to birth; that is, he should wait in patience for the appointed time because in both cases "ripeness is (*i. e.* ought to be) all."

This interpretation does more than harmonize with the immediate context, it brings us nearer to one of the great motifs of the play. In the other great tragedies of Shakespeare our sympathies go out to individual sufferers, but in *Lear,* more than in all other plays, we are moved and purified by the sense that life itself is tragic. We must accept this mysterious burden of life, this weight of misery that is laid upon us, and we must bear it, "endure" it, until the gods shall give us leave to lay it down. Gloster must learn the lesson that Lear has learned in a rough school, and it is Lear himself who teaches it to Gloster:

> If thou wilt weep my fortune, take my eyes.
> I know thee well enough; thy name is Gloster;
> *Thou must be patient;* we came crying hither.
> Thou know'st, the first time that we smell the air,
> We waul, and cry:—I will preach to thee:—mark.
> (IV. 6, 172)

There is, consequently, a slight distinction between the associated passages in *Lear* and *Hamlet,* a difference in emphasis, perhaps, rather than a difference in meaning, which, elusive as it is, is full of significance. The situation in the two plays is distinctly dissimilar. When he spoke the words in question, Hamlet was not contemplating suicide; he was rather disquieted by a presentiment of his approaching death. But, he adds, all that matters is, that a man shall be ready to die when his time comes. By "ready" I suppose Hamlet means here, not fit, or spiritually prepared, as Wordsworth holds, but rather willing. He is thinking, as I understand it, of a conscious acquiescence in the will of that Provi-

dence whose care for man has just been in his mind. "Ripeness" on the other hand, implies no conscious, intelligent act of will. It comes of itself with fulness of growth; it is that maturity given by nature rather than anything that is brought about by man's conscious effort. In the one case, therefore, emphasis is laid on the thought that a man should hold himself ready to die; in the other, on the fact that tragic as life may be, a man should wait patiently until the great forces that rule over life bring his days to an end. Thus understood, Edgar's speech becomes an answer to Gloster's bitter arraignment, "May not the wretched even die when life becomes intolerable?" And Edgar's answer, "No, men must endure," is in the spirit of those words, wonderfully pathetic in the mouth of the tempestuous and choleric Lear, "Thou must be patient."

HENRY S. PANCOAST.

Chestnut Hill, Pa.

TWO LEXICOGRAPHICAL NOTES

I

Büsten and beten

The alliterative phrase *büsten and beten* is first found in two early 13th-century documents written in the Southern dialect, *Hali Meidenhad* and the *Liflade of Saint Juliana*. In *Hali Meidenhad* (rev. ed. F. J. Furnivall, *EETS*, No. 18, 1922, p. 42/455 and p. 43/463) it is pointed out in favor of maidenhood that a husband "*beateð & busteð þe as his ibohte þrel*" "beats and thrashes (Gloss. ed. cit. p. 78, "mauleth, beateth") thee like his bought thrall." Juliana (ed. O. Cockayne, *EETS*, No. 51, 1872, p. 24) says she will hold to her faith "*þah þu me buste and beate*" "though thou thrash (Gloss. ed. cit. p. 89, buste, *baste?*) and beat me."

In the so-called "second" version of the ME. Saint Alexius legend, MS. Laud 463 (ed. F. J. Furnivall, *EETS*, No. 69, p. 53). The passage reads:

> Ofte þei [the servants] him *bete and buste*
> þat þe lord [Eufemian] þer of niste,
> þese wikkede fode. (vv. 331 ff.)

Here the rhyme shows *buste* = *büste* : *niste* = *nüste* < O. E. *nyste*

(cp. Schipper's reading *infra*). According to Dr. Horstmann (Herrig's *Archiv*, LVI, 401) the Laud MS. (Horstmann's Laud L. 70 is *now* Laud 463) is later and in most cases not so good as MS. Trin. Coll. Oxf. 57. The reading of the corresponding passage in the Trin. Coll. MS. (printed parallel by Horstmann and in *EETS*. ed. cit. supra) is as follows:

> Ofte hy him *bete and burste*
> þat þe lord þer of nuste,
> þo vnlede fode. (vv. 331 ff.)

It will be noted at once that the Trin. Coll. MS. has the impossible rhyme *burste: nüste* for *büste: niste* of Laud. In the above-mentioned article Dr. Horstman points out (with examples, p. 401) that both MSS. are from an original in the Southern dialect and that the Trin. Coll. MS., though the older and in general the better, may in many instances be corrected by the readings in Laud. These verses (*Alexius*, 331 ff.) are not included among the instances which he cites to this effect. The existence of the formula as attested in *Hali Meidenhad* and the *Liflade of Saint Juliana*, together with the false rhyme in the Trin. Coll. MS., points conclusively to the superiority of the Laud reading for this line. It may be noted that this is the reading (*buste: nuste*) adopted by Schipper in his critical edition of the text (*Sitz. Ber. Wien. Akad.*, phil-histor. kl., CXIV, 1887, p. 281). Schipper's note to this line (art. cit. p. 301, note to line 331) is very much to the point:

> Die Lesart *burste* (statt *busten* = schlagen) in T[rin Coll. MS.] ist sinnlos und könnte durch Verhören entstanden sein.

I should lay the "Verhören" of the Trin. Coll. scribe to ignorance of the idiom, which seems to be local—Southern—, and to a confusion of *büsten* with *busten*, the popular dialectal pronunciation of *bursten* (*bersten*).

The scribe of the copy of *The Owl and the Nightingale* preserved in MS. Jesus College Oxf. 29 had evidently fallen into the same error and presumably for the same reasons. He gives v. 1610 as follows:

> & me to-burste[þ] & to-bete[þ].

The same line in MS. Cotton Caligula A ix runs:

> an me to-busteþ & to-beteþ

Here we have *to-büsten and to-beten* instead of *büsten and beten,* but the idiom is evidently the same.

In his edition of *O. and N.* (Boston, 1907) J. E. Wells glosses *to-buste* "breaks, rends," (p. 241²), an interpretation apparently based on an identification of *to-busten* with *to-bursten.* The most recent editor, J. W. H. Atkins (Cambridge, 1922) goes so far as to amend the Cotton MS. reading to *to-bu[r]steþ* and in his Glossary gives only **to-bersten* "break," evidently rejecting *to-busten* entirely.

From the foregoing examples there can be no doubt that the reading *to-buste* of the Cotton MS., older and in general better (cp. Atkins' ed., p. xxviii, *β*, where *to-burste* for *to-buste* should be added to the list of J's erroneous substitutions), is right and that the line should be translated "and thrashes me and beats me badly (*to-*)."

The etymology of me. *büsten.*

From the rhyme *buste: niste* (Schipper, *buste: nuste*) in the Laud *Alexius,* the *-u-* in *buste* is evidently for the sound *ü* and is so taken in Bradley-Strattmann's Middle-English Dictionary, sub büsten, "v. *? beat, bruise.*" No OE. *bystan* > ME. *büsten* is recorded, but there are verbs in the related languages which make clear the origin and original meaning of the ME. verb.

There occurs in OIcel. *beysta* "to beat" < **baustjan.* In Swedish dialect we have *bystä* < **bustjan,* in the phrase *bystä till någon* "to strike, knock against someone" (J. E. Rietz, *Svenskt Dialekt-Lexikon,* 1867; apparently not *bysta* "to hackel, comb, cavil at" as cited by NED, sub *bust,* v¹). The ablaut-relationship of *beysta: bystä* is Hochstufe: Schwundstufe, the ablaut-grade which appears in the Latin cognate *fustis* "cudgel, club" (A. Walde, *Etymol. Latein. Wtb.,* 2. Aufl., 1910, *s. v.*). It is unlikely that the Swedish dialect *bystä,* or the OIcel. *beysta* (>ME. **beisten*), lies directly behind ME. *büsten,* but we may accept as the etymon an OE. **bystan* (< **bustjan*) "to strike," standing in clear relationship to verbal roots represented in the North Germanic languages. (For further examples and wider relations of this root, cp. Verwijs and Verdam, *Middelnederl. Woordenboek,* 1885, sub *buust* (*buyst*) "cudgel," and E. Hellqvist, *Svensk Etymol. Ordbok,* Lund 1920-, sub *bösta*).

II

Lóf and grín

The present note proposes a solution of the phrase *lof* ⁊ *grin* in the following disputed passage in the Peterborough Chronicle, A. D. 1137:

> **"In mani of ðe castles wæron lof ⁊ gri. ð wæron rachenteges ð twa oðer thre men hadden onoh to bæron onne (Earle and Plummer, I, 264)."**

In and for itself and abbreviation *grī* may stand either for *grim,* adj., or *grin,* sb., "a snare" or "hangman's noose" (cf. NED. and Toller's Supplement to Bosworth's *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary s. v.* III). No interpretation has been offered for *lof.* (*Lof.,* n. = Germ. *Lob* would not fit the context and has never been proposed for the present passage). Interpretations of the passage have varied according to the interpretation given *grī.* Editors who expand *grī* to *grim,* adj., have regarded *lof* as a misspelling for *lóð* (OE. *láð,* adj.) and translate the phrase "things loathly and grim." Editors who expand *grī* to *grin,* subst., leave *lof* untranslated, regarding it as the name for an unknown instrument of torment parallel to *grin.* Morris (*Specimens of Early M. E.,* pp. 294-295) proposed an emendation of *lof* to *loc* "bolt, bar, beam," but this has not found favor among later editors.

It seems fairly certain that *lof* and *grī,* to whichever part of speech they belong, are parallel in construction: if one is an adjective, so is the other; if one is a substantive, the other is a substantive also. In favor of their being substantives is the plural verb *wæron;* against this view is the fact that nothing is known of *lof,* sb., which could here be parallel to *grin.* Hence arises the temptation to take *grī* for *grim* and emend *lof* to *lóð.*

Durior lectio preferenda est. Besides *lof* (Germ. *Lob*), *there is* an OE. *lóf,* a rare word (its use here in the Peterborough Chronicle appears to be the only occurrence in post-Conquest English,) found in OE. only in an 11th century gloss to Aldhelm's *de Laudibus Virginitatis* (cf. Giles' ed. p. 76, line 6): redimicula (Aeneid IX, 616), wrædas, cynewiððan, lófas (A. S. Napier, *OE. Glosses,* Oxf. 1900, No. 5241). This establishes an OE. *lof,* sb. m, "fillet" "band," accepted by Toller in the Supplement to Bosworth. At first sight "fillet" or "head-band"

does not strike one as a likely instrument of torment, but the Peterborough annalist gives us a hint as to the sort of fillet or head-band intended only a few lines above the passage under immediate consideration:

> "Men dide cnotted strenges abuton here hæved and wrythen to ðat it gæde to the hærnes (Earle and Plummer, I, 264)."

From fillet, an innocuous article of apparel, *lof* may easily have been extended euphemistically to the sinister head-bands just mentioned.

If OE. *lóf* and eME. *lof* are identical (and nothing in the form or sense seems opposed to such an equation), we have, I think, a satisfactory solution of the problem, for we have *lóf*, sb., grammatically parallel to *gri*(*n*), sb., and with a meaning appropriate to the present context. Taking *grin* to mean "noose" and *lof* "head-band (of some sort or other)," the passage might be translated:

> "In many of the castles were 'head-band and noose'[1] which were (consisted) of chains, (of) which two or three men had enough (to do) to support one."

By this interpretation we at once save the reading of the MS., provide a suitable meaning for *lof*, by establishing grī as *grin*, sb. obviate the necessity doing violence to the syntax, and sharpen up the significance of the passage.

F. P. MAGOUN, JR.

Cambridge, Mass.

[1] There is a possibility that *lóf* ⁊ *grin* are plurals. *Grin*, n. and f. in O.E. with the pl. *grinu* (Sievers-Cook, *Grammar of O.E.*, 3 ed., § 267b) may in dialect have lost the somewhat irregular flexional vowel after the analogy of long stem neuters. Under *lóf*, Toller cites OS. *Harlâf*; this is a gloss to the Virgilian *licia* "id est quod dicimus *harlâf*" (Steinmeyer and Sievers, *Ahd. Glossen*, II. 726a) and seems to be, here, a neut. pl. The OE. simplex *lóf*, if related to the OS. (for vocalism, cp. J. H. Gallee, *Altsäch. Gram.*, 2 ed. § 98), may also have existed as a neuter. If the ME. words are pl., we should probably want a comma after "head-bands," thus considering the clause 'ð *twa oðer thre men* . . .' as modifying *grin*, a ponderous collar similar to such as may be seen in the Nürnberger Burg.

LANDOR'S CRITICISM IN POETRY

An estimate of Walter Savage Landor as a critic of literature is incomplete without notice of his criticism in verse. Landor's judgments on literature are found chiefly in the *Imaginary Conversations,* the *Pentameron,* and in the scattered records of his conversation. In addition, his habit of epigram led him to turn off numerous poems on men of letters, both of the past and of his own time. Of these a few have deservedly been included in anthologies; many are hidden in general collections of Landor's poetry; and a few are in his hitherto unpublished writings.

Many of the poems are whimsical and reflect transient moods. Often they are witty and sharply epigrammatic; Landor was always discharging couplets at his contemporaries. Their value lies in the fact that they exhibit very real feelings of Landor's on literature. Taken together they form a useful supplement to his other critical *dicta.*

Although such verse deals with all types of literature, most of it is concerned with that of Landor's own epoch. His deepest intellectual life was bound up in Greek and Latin literature, but he seldom apostrophized a Greek or Latin writer in ode or epigram. His verse comments on classical literature took the form of the *Hellenics* and the *Heroic Idyls.* He selected characters and scenes from the classics, letting them suggest what he thought of their original creators, but there are few direct invocations to his masters, such as Homer or Sophocles. (See *The Works of Walter Savage Landor,* 1846, II, 666, 639; and also *Heroic Idyls,* 1863, p. 181). Exceptions are the *Lines Written in a Catullus* (*Ibid.,* p. 178), and the short poem on Tibullus (*Ibid.,* p. 259).

In continental literature Landor's first interest was Dante, but there are also verse criticisms of other Italian and of French writers. Landor's well-known aversion to Frenchmen included their literature. His poems *To Victor Hugo* and *To Beranger at Tours* are animated by political rather than literary enthusiasm, Corneille, too, is praised for his courage; he is described as a descendant of Charlotte Corday. The lines to Hugo run:

> Whether a poet yet is left
> In France, I know not, and who knows?

> But Hugo, of his home bereft,
> In quiet Jersey finds repose.
>
> Honour to him who dares to utter
> A word of truth in writ or speech.
> In Hugo's land the brave but mutter
> Half one, in dread whose ear it reach. (*Ibid.*, p. 160.)

On German literature, as in prose of Landor, there is silence. Many anecdotes tell us of his contempt for Goethe, and he had no higher regard for other Germans. On Spanish literature are the lines to Cervantes, among the recently published verse:

> Cervantes was among my first delights,
> Nor was forgotten in maturer age. . . .
> (*Letters and Other Unpublished Writings of Walter Savage Landor*, p. 199.)

Poetry on Italian literature includes Alfieri, Petrarch, and Dante. Landor's tribute in prose to Alfieri occurs in his dialogue between *Alfieri and Metastatio* and in *Alfieri and Salomon the Florentine Jew*. The opening lines of the poem follow:

> Alfieri, thou art present in my sight
> Tho' far removed from us, for thou alone
> Hast toucht the inmost fibres of the breast,
> Since Tasso's tears made damper the damp floor
> Whereon one only light came through the bars.
> (*Heroic Idyls*, p. 118.)

The three dialogues in which Petrarch is a character (and his important role in the *Pentameron*) are supplemented by the personal lines, *With Petrarca's Sonnets*. (*The Works of Walter Savage Landor*, II, 619). Landor's prejudice against Dante, freely expressed in the *Pentameron* and in the *Imaginary Conversations* finds no echo in his poem, *Dante*. This is exalted in tone and eulogistic: "Poet and prophet, give three worlds the law." (*The Last Fruit Off an Old Tree*, p. 426).

In pre-Shakespearean literature Landor was fond of Chaucer and detested Spenser. In the poem, *Chaucer*, he contrasts these two poets:

> In Spenser's labyrinthine rhymes
> I throw my arms o'erhead at times,
> Opening sonorous mouth as wide

As oystershells at ebb of tide.

. . . .

No bodyless and soulless elves
I seek, but creatures like ourselves. (*Heroic Idyls*, p. 142.)

This is a repetition of what Landor says of these two poets in prose. Perhaps Landor's highest compliment to Shakespeare was to prefer him to the ancients. Landor celebrates his genius in many allusions in verse and in the poems *Shakespeare in Italy* (*Ibid.*, p. 234), and *Shakespeare and Milton* (*The Last Fruit Off an Old Tree*, p. 447). The trumpet notes of the latter poem are certainly among the very best from Landor. There is, besides, the brilliant epigram:

In poetry there is but one supreme,
Tho' there are many angels round his throne,
Mighty, and beauteous, while his face is hid.

(*Poems, Dialogues in Verse, and Epigrams*, by Walter Savage Landor, ed. C. G. Crump, II, p. 139. See also *Letters and Other Unpublished Writings of Walter Savage Landor*, poem on *William von Schlegel*, p. 225.)

The English writer between the Elizabethan age and his own whom Landor studied most was Milton. Besides the poem just mentioned, two poems on Milton are noteworthy: the lines *Written in Milton's Defense* (*Heroic Idyls*, p. 196), and *Milton in Italy* (*Supra*). Other verse criticisms of these intervening years were the two poems, both called *Daniel Defoe* (*Letters and Other Unpublished Writings of Walter Savage Landor*, pp. 203-203); *Cowley's Style* (*The Last Fruit Off an Old Tree*, p. 369); *On Pope* (*Dry Sticks Fagoted*, p. 79); *Gibbon* (*Ibid.*, p. 120); *Goldsmith and Gray* (*Ibid.*, p. 119). The quatrain on Swift and Pope is an imaginary epigram from Swift which concludes:

A little dentifrice and soap
Is all the harm I wish poor Pope.

In the rather long poem on Gibbon Landor praises the historian's style, as he had done in the *Imaginary Conversations*. He doubtless felt a natural sympathy for Gibbon's phraseology, which was, in some respects, like his own:

There are those who blame thee for too stately step
And words resounding from inflated cheek.

> Words have their proper places, just like me,
> I listen to, nor venture to reprove,
> Large language swelling under gilded domes,
> Byzantin, Syrian, Persipolitan.

Gibbon is compared to Thucydides. Landor also praises, in the eighteenth century, Goldsmith and Gray in contrast to Byron "the school-girl's pet." Landor venerated Gray. He once remarked that if forced to choose the lines in English literature he would wish most to have written, he would hesitate between Gray's:

> The boast of heraldry, the pomp of power . . . .

and George Herbert's:

> Sweet day, so cool, so calm, so bright . . . .
> (for verse comments on Dryden, Johnson, Churchill, see *The Works of Walter Savage Landor*, II, 639; on Burns, *Heroic Idyls*, p. 181.)

Most of Landor's criticism of literature in verse is concerned with the nineteenth century. Probably no nineteenth century poet, except Swinburne, was so accustomed to record his impressions of contemporary literature in verse. There are, for example, no less than ten different poems (in English and Latin) on Southey. Two of these, *On the Death of Southey* (1853) (*Poems, Dialogues in Verse, and Epigrams*, ed. C. G. Crump, p. 232), and *On Southey's Death* (1858) (*Ibid.*, p. 267) are touched by deep and sincere emotion. No one who has read the first poem can forget the vision of Southey with his little son, and the second has all the stern grandeur of Landor's best epigrams:

> Southey, my friend of forty years, is gone,
> And, shattered by the fall, I stand alone.

The other poems indicate in various ways what Landor found in Southey. He is "the rare architect of many a wondrous tale" (*The Works of Walter Savage Landor*, II, 670); "poet, sage, or hero" (*Ibid.*, p. 267); and he teaches "the song men ought to sing." (*The Last Fruit Off an Old Tree*, p. 387). Among the numerous poems on Wordsworth is that written in 1833, *To Wordsworth*. After the apostrophe to Wisdom, the inspirer of Words-

worth, come the lines which describe the kinship between Wordsworth and Landor:

> We both have run o'er half the space
> Listed for mortals' earthly race;
> We both have crossed life's fervid line,
> And other stars before us shine:
> May they be bright and prosperous
> As those that have been stars for us!
> Our course by Milton's light was sped,
> And Shakespeare shining overhead:
> Chatting on deck was Dryden too,
> The Bacon of the rhyming crew;
> None ever cross'd our mystic sea
> More richly stored with thought than he:
> Tho' never tender or sublime,
> He wrestles with and conquers Time.
> To learn my lore on Chaucer's knee,
> I left much prouder company;
> Thee gentle Spenser fondly led,
> But me he mostly sent to bed.

Another suggestion of like ideals in the two poets occurs in the poem, *Written at Hurstmonceaux, On Reading a Poem of Wordsworth's* (*The Works of Walter Savage Landor,* II, 670). Landor was hostile in his criticism of Wordsworth not only in the *Imaginary Conversations,* but in his poetry: we hear of Wordsworth's "curds and whey" (*Heroic Odyls,* p. 187); or encounter the following: "Wordsworth's low coo brings over me sound sleep" (*Ibid.,* p. 181).

Landor's attitude towards Byron was constantly changing. His prose has many acknowledgments of Byron's powers. But the mutual irritation between them, which lasted till Byron's death—in Landor's eyes an atonement—called from Landor many a bitter line:

> Like mad-dog in the hottest day
> Byron runs snapping straight away,
> And those fellows judge ill
> Who go without a whip or cudgel. (*Ibid.*, p. 203.)

Landor did not understand Byron's misanthropy. The *Remonstrance and Advice to Byron* runs:

> Say, Byron, why is thy attar
> Profusely dasht with vinegar?

Each of them in its place is good,
But neither fit for daily food.
Open thy latticed window wide
For breezes from the Aegean tide.

(*Ibid.*, p. 148. See also *The Works of Walter Savage Landor*, II, 639; *The Last Fruit Off an Old Tree*, p. 385; and *Heroic Idyls*, p. 203.)

The fine lines *To Browning* compare Browning to Chaucer. (*The Works of Walter Savage Landor*, II, 673). Landor's friendship with Charles Dickens inspired two poems, both called *To Dickens* (*Ibid.*, II, 670), besides an epigram (*Heroic Idyls*, p. 164). Hunt is humourously abused in *To Leigh Hunt, On an Omission in his "Feast of the Poets"* (*The Works of Walter Savage Landor*, II, 660), and in the poem *To Joseph Ablett* (*Ibid.*, II, 673) he is described as he "whom Dryden's force and Spenser's fays, Have heart and soul possess'd." Landor liked Macaulay's *Lays of Ancient Rome.* He praises them in *To Macaulay* (*Ibid.*, II, 673) and in the *Remonstrance to Macaulay* (*Heroic Idyls*, p. 147). Macaulay, he says

. . . . rushes on and hails by turns
High-crested Scott, broad breasy Burns,
And shows the British youth, who ne'er
Will lag behind, what Romans were.

(*The Works of Walter Savage Landor*, II, 673. See also *Macaulay's Peerage* in *Dry Sticks Fagoted*, p. 64.)

The list of Landor's verse criticisms might be expanded. They include: Richard Milnes, Lamb, Barry Cornwall, Thackeray, Shelley, P. J. Bailey, Jeffrey, Gifford, Miss Mitford, Tennyson, T. J. Mathias, T. Garrow, R. Landor, and G. P. R. James. In all of these the reader will meet with Landor's wit, temper, quixotic enthusiasms, and high ideals as a critic of literature. (All the poems concerning the writers just mentioned may be found in the editions of Landor mentioned in this paper).

Stanley T. Williams.

Yale University.

A NOTE ON JONSON'S *STAPLE OF NEWS*

None of Jonson's editors has offered an explanation of the word 'Naometry' which occurs in the following passage:

1 Customer.	Have you in your profane shop any news Of the saints at Amsterdam?
Register.	Yes; how much would you?
1 Customer.	Six penny-worth.
Register.	Lay your money down.—Read, Thomas.
Thomas.	The saints do write, they expect a prophet shortly, The prophet Baal, to be sent over to them, To calculate a time, and half a time, And the whole time, according to Naometry.
Pennyboy junior.	What's that?
Thomas.	The measuring of the temple; a cabal Found out but lately, and set out by Archie, Or some such head, of whose long coat they have heard, And, being black, desire it.[1]

There can be little doubt that Jonson is here referring to the *Naometria,* a work by the German antiquary and mystic Simon Studion.[2]

[1] Ben Jonson, *The Staple of News*, Act III, Scene 1. (*Works*, ed. W. Gifford, London, 1875, v, 228-30. The lines: 'To calculate . . . . the temple'; serve to define *Naometry* in *The New English Dictionary*. No other example of the use of the word and no further comments upon its meaning appear there.

[2] I am entirely indebted to Arthur E. Waite's *The Brotherhood of the Rosy Cross* (London, 1924) for my material concerning Studion and his work. Waite maintains that the doctrines of the Rosicrucians have their origin in the *Naometria* and not in the works of Andreae to which they have generally been attributed. *Vide op. cit.*, pp. 35 ff., and Note xxi, p. 639.

The complete title of the *Naometria* is: Naometria, seu nuda et prima Libri, intus et foris scripti per clavem Davidis et calamum virgae similem, Apertio: In quo non tantum cognoscenda tam S. Scripturae totius quam Naturae quoque universae Mysteria brevis sit Introductio. Verum etiam Prognosticus (Stellae illius Matutinae Anno Domini 1572 conspectae ductu) demonstratur Adventus ille Christi ante Diem novissimum Secundus, per quem, Homine Peccati, Papa, cum filio suo perditionis Mehameto, divinitus devastato, ipse Ecclesiam suam et principatus mundi

Studion was born at Urach in Württemberg in 1543 and graduated at Tübingen in 1565. Later he is said to have become a 'preceptor' in Marbach, near Ludwigsburg. He was occupied, in part, with the collection of precious stones and monuments which is now in the Library at Stuttgart. In 1586 he may have attended at Lüneburg in Hanover a memorable assembly of a religious character, out of which there seems to have arisen the so-called 'Militia Cruficera Evangelica'—or otherwise, the Evangelical Brotherhood.[3] For a time he appears to have been persecuted by his enemies because of the phophecies made in the first part of the *Naometria*.[4] Quite uncertain is the date of his death.[5]

The *Naometria* is described by Waite as a quarto manuscript in Latin containing 1790 pages—exclusive of a preface or dedication to the Duke of Württemberg which runs for 177 pages.[6] It was not completed until 1604, although Studion had written a part as early as 1593.[7]

Naometria signified "a mystic measurement—that is to say, of the temple—as if a deep understanding concerning it. The symbolical expression is reminiscent of Kabalistic tracts on the Delineation of the Celestial temples, the measurement of the Divine Body, and R. Eliezer's Measuremen tof the Earthly temple; but the immediate allusion is to the Apocalypse, x, 1."[8] The work also contained a prophecy concerning the second Advent of Christ and the destruction of the Pope and Mahomet. In general Studion stood for all the doctrines of extreme protestantism.[9]

It is clear that Jonson connects the doctrines set forth in the *Naometria* with those professed by the Brownists. It seems highly

restaurabit, ut in iis post hac sit cum ovili Pastor Unus. In Cruciferae Militiae Evangelicae gratiam, authore Simone Studione inter Scorpiones. Pars Prima. . . Interlocutores Nathanael, Cleophas. Anno Consistorium, 1604. This is the general title. The work is divided into two parts and contains subtitles. There is also an appendix designated Hieroglyphicus Simonis Studionis, Versus de instantis temporis fato imminente. For subtitles vide Waite, *op. cit.*, Note xxi, p. 639.

[3] Waite, *op. cit.*, pp. 39, 40.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 51, note 1.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 47-8.

[6] Other matter brings the total number of introductory pages to 205. *Vide* Waite, *op. cit.*, p. 46, and cf. Note xxi, p. 639.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 51. [8] *Ibid.*, p. 44. [9] *Ibid.*, p. 642.

probable that these Dissenters, who had settled in Holland to escape persecution in England, had really come in contact, if not actually with a manuscript of the *Naometria,* at any rate with some account of its contents. But this was not until at least fifteen or sixteen years after the completion of Studion's work, since *The Staple of News* was played for the first time in 1626 and seems to have been written during the years 1622-23 with additions in 1625-26.[10]

The questions "How may the Brownists have become familiar with the *Naometria?*" and "How did Jonson learn about it?" can, at present, be answered only conjecturally. The Brownists were, if we may believe Jonson, introduced to this 'cabal' by 'Archie,' or 'some such head.' The connection of this particular name with the mysteries of the society has a double significance, for the Archie to whom Jonson refers was not only the court fool but also a bigoted devotee of the Scottish Church. Some similar adherent to the Reformed Church in Holland or in Germany, captivated by the bibliolatry and the burning Protestantism of Naometric teaching may well have begun either to expound it to the sympathetic 'saints,' or to set it forth compendiously in writing. It is easy to see that such teaching would have been most congenial to this sect of Amsterdam, for Studion and those whom he represented were 'looking for a renovation of the earth' and a 'general reform to come.' Ultra Protestant in their teaching, they were 'heated with apocalyptic dreams,' and regarded the Pope as Antichrist.

A priori, it seems most unlikely that Jonson ever saw a copy of the *Naometria,* for it was never printed. There are only two manuscripts of the work known to Waite. Both of these are in the Landesbibliothek at Stuttgart.[11] There is no record of it in the catalogues of manuscripts in the libraries of Great Britain and Ireland to which I have had recourse. What Jonson did know of Studion and Naometry was probably gained by travellers' tales of the doctrinal vagaries of the good 'saints of Amsterdam.'

JOHN F. ENDERS.

Harvard University.

[10] *The Staple of News by Ben Jonson,* ed. D. Winter, New York, 1905, pp. xviii, xix, xx.

[11] Waite, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

Taine et l'Angleterre, par F. C. Roe. Paris: Champion, 1923. (Bibliothèque de la Revue de Littérature Comparée, Tome VI).

Taine had confidence in his *coup d'œil.* An impressive example of the fact had lately been provided by the publication of the fragmentary *Voyage en Allemagne.*[1] The critic had gone to Germany in 1870 in search of first-hand information for a book analogous to his *Histoire de la Littérature Anglaise,* and the resultant notes, interrupted almost immediately and covering a period of only twelve days, show him accumulating *petits faits.* He has not begun to organize, and his style in consequence lacks its usual architectonic excellence, but he is eager for a generalization, and on the last day he writes with satisfaction: "Je commence à pouvoir classer les types moraux. . . . Ce qui m'a gêné si longtemps, c'est le trait essentiel; le plus répandu de tous, l'indétermination." In a word he approaches a solution, after a *long* embarrassment, at the end of a sojourn of less than a fortnight.

His celerity of judgment in the case of England, Mr. Roe now shows, is hardly less; indeed before publishing his two books on Britain, Taine had spent there a total of only ten weeks.

Mr. Roe makes a thorough investigation of the reactions of guest and hosts and supplies an abundance of useful information concerning what places Taine visited, what kinds of people he met or failed to meet, and concerning his possession of the English language (which he knew admirably but pronounced atrociously, so that if he appreciated the music of English verse, as he claimed, it was certainly not the poets' music). There is a shrewd discussion of Taine's inadequate treatment of English humour, and the generalization that the critic's "interprétation des choses est statique et non dynamique," which is entirely in accord with Lord Morley's view,[2] is sound.[3] The author would have found an excellent and significant example of this fact in Taine's treatment of

[1] *Revue des Deux Mondes,* 1er décembre 1920.

[2] Cf. his review of *l'Ancien Régime* in *Critical Miscellanies,* III, 261 ff.

[3] Less sound is the conception of Taine's doctrine revealed by the sentence "Tout déterministe qu'il soit, il se laisse séduire par le spectacle de la lutte morale" (p. 136). The consideration of "la lutte morale" is more constantly present in Taine's mind than this suggests. Cf. especially his letter to Bourget, on *le Disciple,* in *Correspondance,* IV, 287-293.

Shakespeare, but, contrary to the promise of the general title (revised in the first sentence of the preface), he deals only with Taine's views of nineteenth-century England.

What does Taine's treatment of England reveal in the last analysis, concerning his philosophy of criticism? Mr. Roe makes many valid objections to this or that specific conclusion of Taine, but he fails—and this may be said to be the disappointment of the book, otherwise so valuable—he fails to lead to the expected final appraisal. He brings up the issue once in terms of a quotation from Leslie Stephen (" étudier l'organisme dans son rapport avec le milieu "), but without comment, and about another discussion of the same issue his only remark is " très intéressant." There is risk here of arriving at a final chapter which, like that in Johnson's *Rasselas,* may be labelled a " Conclusion in which nothing is concluded." A scientific caution sparing of generalisations is commendable—but one might, without trespassing upon metaphysics, venture a hypothesis.

There seems to be one latent in Mr. Roe's material. His numerous objections to Taine's results are objections not to doctrine but to application. When Taine the relativist clearly fails it is, these cases seem to show, because he was not relativistic enough. The general difficulty, Mr. Roe says, is that Taine " n'a pas suffisamment pratiqué les diverses classes et les divers milieux." He did not differentiate adequately between the English and the Scotch. He did not understand Thackeray for lack of an intimate acquaintance with the *nuances* of his character. If he failed to comprehend the temperament of Swinburne as revealed on the occasion of a dinner party, it was because Taine did not know that Swinburne was seated too close to an unbearably hot fire and was devoting his attention not to the social function but to protecting his back with a copy of the *Times.* Here is proof that vice and virtue are products like vitriol and sugar. It would have been illuminating had Mr. Roe given us finally his specialist's opinion as to whether it was chiefly the deterministic theory or Taine's pioneer rashness in the application of it that is reprehensible.[4] So far as

[4] No one can deny Taine's rashness, but it is severe to refer to his method as one " d'après laquelle les conclusions précèdent la documentation " (p. 44). Roe himself cites cases where Taine revises his opinion in the presence of new evidence (pp. 121, 135). Compare the significant problem of Taine's adaptability in the case of his judgment of Tennyson.

he has touched upon this subject he has shown nothing that essentially damages what seems to have been Taine's immense contribution to criticism.

In any case Mr. Roe's book is informing and readable. He is especially to be commended for the felicitous discovery of the unedited letters (from Arnold, Spencer, *et al.*) published in an Appendix. And a valuable addition to Giraud's *Bibliographie Critique,* of 1902 and now necesarily incomplete, is provided by his book-list.[5]

Amherst College. HORATIO E. SMITH.

Die Grundlage der Phonetik, von Jörgen Forchhammer. Heidelberg: Winter, 1924. viii + 212 pp.

Mr. Forchhammer gives to his interesting and valuable treatise the following sub-title: *Ein Versuch, die phonetische Wissenschaft auf fester sprachphysiologischer Grundlage aufzubauen.* His program is ambitious, and in carrying it through he falls into error now and then, like the rest of us mortals. He has certainly succeeded, however, in giving a clear and systematic account of the phonetic side of speech, and in more cases than one he has

Taine inquired of Palgrave (the latter reports in his Personal Recollections, *Tennyson, a Memoir by his Son,* London, 1897, II, 497), concerning the supposed luxuriousness of Tennyson's surroundings, and being set right he, not perhaps eagerly, revised his first conjecture about the personal sybaritism of the poet. John Richard Green relates the same incident, as he heard it from Palgrave, but with a piquancy of his own and with his own downright conclusion about the inflexibility of the Frenchman: "M. Taine bit his lip, thanked him for his information, went home—and when the book came out, Tennyson was found still painted as the young voluptuary, the rich profligate of M. Taine's fancy. The story is really an index to the whole character of his book." (*Letters of J. R. Green,* London, 1901, p. 372). Professor Babbitt in his *Masters of French Criticism* (Boston, 1913, p. 343) accepts with mild foot-note reservation the interpretation of Green. But the text of the chapter on the poet does not paint Tennyson as personally a young voluptuary, Palgrave's account is more authentic than Green's, and Roe, who mentions only Palgrave, is in this instance—and properly—less severe.

[5] Misprints seem few. We have noted: p. 32, *Lui,* read *lui;* p. 88, *Gobden,* read *Cobden;* p. 92, *1879,* read *1789;* p. 114, *1850,* read *1859;* p. 187, *Thième,* read *Thieme.*

been able to clarify for us articulatory details that hitherto wanted an explanation.

The work under review is an expansion of an earlier paper of the author's, entitled *Systematik der Sprachlaute als Grundlage eines Weltalphabets.* And in fact most of the book is devoted to an exposition of yet a new system of phonetic notation. Mr. Forchhammer's world alphabet is carefully thought out and deserves to be studied. It suffers however from the usual deficiences of such alphabets. The amount of detailed information which one must give in order to describe an articulation with scientific accuracy cannot be crowded within the compass of a single symbol, however adorned with diacritical marks. And since Mr. Forchhammer relies on diacritics more than do most of his fellows, his symbols are even more hopelessly overloaded than usual. Thus, over a dozen *Feinheiten* must be indicated by auxiliary signs placed under the symbol; how room is to be found for all these signs the author does not bother to explain. And there remain the numerous marks to go over the symbol, to its right and its left, and at its four corners!

Mr. Forchhammer's treatment of phonetic problems is noteworthy for brevity and clarity. He is a little too fond of polemics, and is prone to look upon his own ideas as the only possible ideas, but this too makes for clarity at least! And in spite of his rather assertive style the positions he takes are usually sane and sensible enough. But he has one bad habit, and it is a bad habit indeed. Whether his ideas be new or old, he almost invariably presents them as if they were new and revolutionary. Thus, he gives us a long polemic on the subject of stops; what he says was better said, long ago, by Jespersen, but the uninitiated reader will almost certainly imagine that Mr. Forchhammer was the origina pro-pounder of the theory which he expounds with so much vigor.

I will now turn to more detailed criticism, taking up only matters in which I differ with the author. On p. 6 the affricate in the German word *Hetz* is analyzed into two sounds, *t* and *s*, and an *Übergangslaut* connecting these—three sounds in all. I cannot subscribe to such an analysis, which does violence to one's natural *Sprachgefühl* and is open to serious objection even from a purely theoretical point of view. For affricates, like diphthongs, must be taken as single sounds, though of course they are complex,

not simple. It would be absurd to say that the diphthong [ai] is made up of the two sounds [a] and [i] and a transition sound connecting them. If we say [a] and follow it up with [i] we are far from getting [ai] as a result. In fact, [ai] is a glide, beginning somewhere about [a] and ending somewhere about [i]. It is one sound, composital, indeed, but thoroughly unified for all that. Hence it is easy to say an isolated [ai] but very hard if not impossible to isolate any one of its component parts. Similarly, the German affricate *z* or *tz* is one sound. It begins as a stop and ends as a spirant, it is true. In other words, it is composital, like the diphthong. But the stop differs from the simple *t*, the spirant from the simple *s*. Stop and spirant are welded together into a unified sound which cannot be split up and pronounced each element for itself. Were Mr. Forchhammer a native German he would feel this, I think. Certainly he would hardly analyze his own Danish affricate *t* as stop + transition sound + spirant.

On pp. 8 f. the author makes a journey to Greenland in order to find a non-explosive variety of [k, t, p]. But surely so long a pilgrimage was needless. In English such non-explosive stops are familiar enough. They occur with great regularity in final position, as in such a word as *hat* at the end of a sentence. Here (in American pronunciation, at least) the pause begins with the stop, and though of course the tongue is withdrawn from the gums sooner or later, minutes or even hours may elapse before the withdrawal takes place. In other words, the withdrawal, when it does take place, is no part of the articulation of the *t*, an articulation which concluded, of course, when the pause set in.

On p. 46 we are told that the oral resonance chamber gets its shape through the sagittal movements of the tongue, the vertical movements of the jaw and the horizontal movements of the lips. But the tongue too has its horizontal movements: as I have elsewhere explained, its two lateral zones may move towards each other or away from each other. The centripetal motion makes the so-called round vowels; the centrifugal, the so-called spread vowels. The horizontal movements of the lingual zones are usually accompanied by corresponding movements of the lips. Hence rounding at least has come to be associated with the labial articulation. But it is easy enough to produce a round vowel without rounding

the lips, as the reader will learn if he tries it. The activities of the lips are secondary, those of the tongue primary, in the formation of both round and spread vowels. Mr. Forchhammer, like all phoneticians unacquainted with my *Phonology of Modern Icelandic,* has failed to analyze properly this aspect of lingual articulation.

In working out a universal vowel system the author contents himself with a two-fold division according to place of articulation: front vowels and back vowels. He regards the setting up of an intermediate group (mean or "mixed" vowels) as a useless complication. Indeed, he issues a kind of challenge. He says (p. 51), "Mir ist jedenfalls keine einzige Sprache bekannt, in der . . . Vorder-, Mittel- und Hinterzungenvokale prinzipiell als verschiedene Sprachlaute nebeneinander Verwendung finden. . . ." This challenge can be easily met. In Norwegian, the vowels *o, u, y* are all high and rounded. They are distinguishable only by their place of articulation, viz., back, mean and front respectively. Similarly, in English the vowel sounds in the words *far, fur, fare* are all low and spread. They too are distinguishable only by their place of articulation, viz., back, mean and front respectively. I therefore look upon it as a fundamental defect in Mr. Forchhammer's system that he makes no provision for mean vowels.

A similar objection can be raised to the author's consonant system; he provides for dentals and velars, but not for palatals. Indeed, he does not consider it necessary to carry out even the distinction between dentals and velars, when he comes to deal with r-sounds, while he groups [j] and [ɤ] alike under the head "Vorderzunge." His table of *Engelaute* especially, or "straits," as I call them, is open to serious objection on the ground of inconsistency. Moreover, it has other defects. The author classifies straits into *Hautreibelaute, Zahnreibelaute, Anblaselaute* and *Zitterlaute.* The classification is new and interesting, but suffers, I think, from incurable weaknesses. Mr. Forchhammer is justly concerned to work the liquids into his classification, not being content to leave them outside as a class (or two classes) to themselves. He was unable to do anything with r-sounds, however, and was compelled to classify them as trills, and give them a column all by themselves, although in fact the trill is by no means essential to the articulation of an [r] and often fails to appear—

and this not by reduction either, as the author supposes. The [l] lent itself better to systematizing, and by a *tour de force* Mr. Forchhammer was able to include it among his *Zahnreibelaute*. Yet in order to include it there he was compelled to make the friction of the breath-stream against the back teeth the fundamental characteristic of all [l] sounds! As a matter of fact, this friction is of little consequence. A gentleman of my acquaintance, who has no teeth at all, nevertheless says his [l] famously! The characteristic [l]-closure along the middle line of the roof of the mouth causes the breath-stream to break into two side streams at the point of closure. Ordinarily the closure is at the gums or teeth. The stream breaks, then, on the clive (i. e., the fore wall of the mouth), and is forced out against the lips and (to a less extent) the cheeks. The air finally makes its escape, of course, by being forced out between the lips. Such friction as takes place is mostly concentrated in the front part of the mouth, against which the air stream is continually being driven. The teeth, and particularly the back teeth, play a very subordinate part in breaking the stream and producing fricative sounds. The inner cheek walls immediately around the labial orifice do most of the breaking and give most of the fricative effect. The lower lip is of especially great importance here, as also in s- and š-sounds. Mr. Forchhammer's table, then, can hardly be called satisfactory. The following table is based on the classification in my *Phonology of Modern Icelandic*. Although not reduced to terms so simple as Mr. Forchhammer's, it is, I think, more in accord with the facts:

Stem Straits

	back			front	
	fast bar	loose bar	clear	fast bar	clear
vibrant	velar [*l*]	velar [*r*]	[*g*]	pal. [*l*]	[*j*]
surd	velar [*ḷ*]	velar [*r̥*]	[*x*]	pal. [*ḷ*]	[*ç*]

Crown Straits

	fast bar	loose bar			clear		
		thick	mean	thin	thick	mean	thin
vibrant	dent. [*l*]	[*ʒ*]	[*ř*]	[*r*]	[*z*]	Span. [ð]	Eng. [ð]
surd	dent. [*ḷ*]	[*ʃ*]	—	[*r̥*]	[*s*]	Span. [þ]	Eng. [þ]

Lip Straits

	thick	mean	thin
vibrant	[*w*]	[*v*]	[v]
surd	[*h*]	[ʃ]	[f]

One might discuss other questions raised by the author. But limitations of space forbid, and I will conclude by saying that the work under review, though it contains not a few errors and dubious analyses, yet remains stimulating and instructive by virtue of the author's freshness of approach and originality of treatment. It is a dangerous book for the beginner, but a useful book for the initiated.

KEMP MALONE.

The Johns Hopkins University.

Gédéon Huet, *Les contes populaires.* Paris, E. Flammarion, 1923. 192 pp. (Bibliothèque de Culture générale).

The science of Folklore has recently lost two of its most able representatives in France, Emmanuel Cosquin and Gédéon Huet. The latter died while his last work was in press.

As a manual the little book of M. Huet will be a safe and practical guide for beginners and laymen. In the first chapter (*Le problème des contes populaires*) a rapid survey of the study of fairy tales is given, beginning with the first critical essays on Perrault's collection. Classifying the existing folk-tales M. Huet distinguishes fairy tales proper (contes merveilleux), serious stories of a more realistic character (contes), merry tales (fabliaux), and animal tales (contes d'animaux). The outstanding feature of all folk-tales is the existence of fixed types found in the most widely separated countries, and their truly international character. To account for this fact three great theories have been established, namely (1) the mythical theory of the Grimms, G. W. Dasent and Max Müller, (2) the Oriental theory of Benfey and Cosquin, and (3) the anthropological theory of Lang and Tylor. On pp. 38 ff. a good review is given of fairy tales and fairy tale motifs occurring in ancient literature. Certain tales show by their plot that they can have been invented only in a definite period and in a definite civilization.

Chapter II (*Evolution et formation des contes populaires*) begins with a definition of the term Popular Tale: Les contes populaires sont des récits traditionnels, oraux, transmis surtout—mais non exclusivement—par des gens du peuple. M. Huet adds significantly that this definition does not answer the question of origin, that a literary story may for instance become a popular one, a fact, be it said, long recognized for folk-songs. These tales are not told to children only but, especially in backward societies, to adults as well. The story-tellers are sometimes men, generally however old women. The main difference between folk-tales and legends is that no belief is attached to the former, while the latter put forth some claim to historicity. A folk-tale may become a legend by the introduction of historical or pseudo-historical data. Certain outstanding features common to most folk-tales (no definite time and place and the happy ending), and especially the treatment accorded to the upper classes of society, while the hero, usually a poor devil, conquers all obstacles by good luck or his own intelligence, permit us to conclude that our folk-tales are essentially the work of the lower strata of society, leaving out of account such as may have arisen at a time anterior to the division of human society into various social strata. Many tales furthermore clearly show the hand of women narrators, while others were certainly invented with a moral aim in view (respect of taboos, honoring the dead, etc.). Coming to the question of origins, M. Huet rejects the theory of polygenesis, according to which a tale could have been invented independently in different localities and at different times. This theory may hold for simple motifs, but it cannot be assumed for whole stories representing a complicated plot and a contamination of very definite motifs in the same order. On p. 84 he develops the rules which must guide the investigator in his task to determine the country and time of the origin and the courses of the migration of any given folk-tale type, and he illustrates these rules by numerous examples.

In Chapter III (*Les contes populaires et la littérature*) M. Huet points out the existence of fairy tales in ancient and mediaeval literature (Old Testament, *Odyssey,* Apuleius, *Basin, Berthe aux grand pieds, Chevalier au Cygne, Merchant of Venice, Don Juan,* etc.), and he ends his little book with a survey of the great Oriental compilations from the *Jatakas* to the *Arabian Nights.*

There are few points on which folklorists might take exception to M. Huet's lucid and fair exposition. The most important is doubtless the absence of bibliographical data and an index. Two theories have been disposed of altogether too lightly, the mythical one of Max Müller and the dream theory of L. Laistner. The fact that both have been grotesquely exaggerated by indiscreet disciples must not blind us to the fact that there are cases in which they are still applicable, though neither can be said to open a majority of all mythological locks.

If as an American and an admirer of M. Huet's work I may be allowed to make a suggestion I venture to add this. Inasmuch as the valuable contributions of the great folklorist are scattered in learned journals most of which are not accessible in the States, would it not be a good undertaking to republish the most valuable of them in a separate volume of *Mélanges?* The *Bibliothèque Nationale* may well afford to pay this last tribute to its servant. But if this should not prove feasible, even a printed pamphlet containing an index of M. Huet's writings would be very helpful.

ALEXANDER HAGGERTY KRAPPE.

University of Minnesota.

The Background of Gray's 'Elegy.' A Study in the Taste for Melancholy Poetry, 1700-1751. By Amy Louise Reed, Ph. D., Professor of English, Vassar College. Columbia University Press, 1924.

Since the appearance of Professor H. A. Beers's excellent *History of English Romanticism in the Eighteenth Century* (1910), additional light has been thrown upon melancholy literature of the time by monographs upon individual writers, by Dr. Van Tieghem's brief but suggestive survey in *La Poésie de la Nuit et des Tombeaux en Europe au XVIIIe Siècle* (1921), and by Professor Raymond D. Havens's thorough study of Miltonic imitations. Miss Reed has undertaken to reintegrate the most popular and typical manifestations of the mood for the purpose of replacing Gray's *Elegy* against its original background. The six chapters of her study explain, respectively, "The Seventeenth

Century Definition of Melancholy," "The Taste for Melancholy in 1700," "The Revolt against Melancholy, 1700-1725," "Melancholy and Description, 1725-1750," "The Persistence of Melancholy and its Ethical Condemnation, 1725-1750," "The Perfection of Form; Gray's 'Elegy,' 1751." All students of the eighteenth century will be grateful for a detailed study of a very important psychological phenomenon which has never before been treated in its entirety. Some historians of the period have been inclined to dismiss the solemnity of grave-yard poetry as the affectation of a literary cult; Miss Reed's investigation makes it clear that the melancholy of poetry was deeply rooted in the national temper and was, moreover, merely a continuation of a chronic habit.

The subject is so broad and has so many ramifications that a somewhat arbitrary selection of material was perhaps unavoidable. With this fact in mind and with no intention of detracting from the merits of a valuable contribution to scholarship, I take the liberty of suggesting additions which, in my opinion, would materially improve the worth of the book. In a preliminary study of the seventeenth-century melancholists, attention might very properly be given to the two perfect exemplars in poetry—George Wither and divine Quarles—especially to their *Emblems,* for these were unquestionably known by the melancholy fraternity of the next century, directly and indirectly through imitators. As Miss Reed's work proves, the universal *materia poetica* of the atrabiliar versifiers was death. Long since (as far back as the Middle Ages) gruesome illustrations had become an inseparable adjunct of the *meditatio mortis,* and, as Douce's study of the Dance of Death evinces, neither the literary nor the pictorial representation of the King of Terrors can be studied wholly apart from its complement. These two modes of morbid suggestion were united perfectly in the Emblem of the seventeenth century. Also if the *ne plus ultra* of pre-Restoration gloom is sought—the climax of the movement and the complete anticipation of Young's unmitigated solemnity—it will be found in *Midnights Meditations of Death* (1646), a volume of mortuary verse effectively advertised as having been "perused" by the divine Quarles himself immediately before he died. Habington, of the same period, demands at least a reference because, if for no other reason, some passages

in the final section of *Castara* were lingering in Gray's memory when he composed the *Elegy*.

In spite of a few notable exceptions—Flatman's poetry, for example, and John Quarles's—it is obvious that the prestige of literary melancholy suffered a sudden decline after 1660. Towards the close of the century, however, there was a complete recrudescence of pious sentiment. These fluctuations in taste are noted by Miss Reed. It is somewhat surprising to find nothing said in this connection of the lugubrious contributions made by John Dunton. Most of these, to be sure, were mere compilations of stolen material; but the dishonesty of the "methodizer" in no way detracts from their significance as either a symptom or an influence. Dunton is one of the unmistakable links of connection between two ages of literary religiosity. His projects would indeed afford an ideal starting-point for a study of the relations between the two periods. Miss Reed has discussed the pessimistic influence of Rochester; it would be well to include also the morbid use made of the brilliant young cynic's death in the moralized reports published by Burnet and others. These probably did more to intimidate the gay and to solemnize the middle classes than any other sensational reading they had except the story of Francis Spira's death. Rochester, in fact, became a renegade to his party and betrayed the cause of Restoration skepticism into the hands of the puritanic. For a contrary reason, the diagnosis of poetical taste in 1700 suffers through the omission of the flood of elegy that issued in 1695 from poets of all ranks (Dryden excepted) to bewail the death of Queen Mary. This one chapter in funeral literature might well have been excepted from the arbitrary exclusion of elegies, for it left a definite stain.

Miss Reed studies intensively only the period between 1700 and 1751, the date of the *Elegy*. She could have made excellent illustrative use of the pseudo-Bunyan prose piece, *Meditations on the Several Ages of Man's Life* (1701), M. Smith's Miltonic poem *The Vision, Or A Prospect of Death, Heav'n and Hell,* etc. (1702), and other poems from the same uninspired pen. One of the most striking manifestations resulted from the death of Lady Grace Gethin in 1697. Her pious remains, published as *Reliquiae Gethinianae* (1699), though since treated with merriment by Dis-

raeli, were honored in a later edition by a prefatory poem from Congreve. The same tragic event inspired Lady Gethin's mother, the Lady Frances Norton, to publish *The Applause of Virtue* (1705), with which was included *Memento Mori: Or, Meditations on Death.* I must insist that Miss Reed's omission of this monumental piece makes a gap all-thing unbecoming in a study of Queen Anne melancholy. In general, the later period is treated much less thoroughly than the early portions of the study lead us to expect. Without insisting upon an exhaustive consideration of a literary type which may easily lead the historian into monotonous repetition, we may reasonably expect a more detailed examination of the special field (1700-1751) than of the historical background. Instead, Miss Reed's scale of treatment apparently diminishes as she proceeds; the result is, we are given an inadequate conception of what was taking place among melancholy *poetae minimi* when Gray made his contribution. The Seatonian prize was established at Cambridge for the specific purpose of encouraging poems upon "Death, Judgment, Heaven, Hell," and similar topics to be announced by the committee. The prize was first awarded to Moses Browne in 1738. From that time on, the Seatonian prize-poem was awaited annually by a complacently gloomy public until all the hopes ever cherished were completely rewarded by Beilby Porteus's masterpiece, *Death: A Poetical Essay* (1759). Classic emnience was attained also by Joseph Trapp's poem, *Thoughts upon the Four Last Things* (1734). Two of the strangest specimens are Thomas Uvedale's *The Death-Bed Displayed with the State of the Dead* (1727) and *The Fear of Death. An Ode* (1739), said to have been written by the notorious Duke of Wharton in his final fit of penitence. The masses of the English people of the eighteenth century were more literal-minded and medievally gloomy than we can well believe without the most explicit and detailed proof. Some phases of the evidence are not even suggested by Miss Reed, such as the absurd funeral customs and the universal habit of attending executions. It seems also that if Burton's *Anatomy* (1621) is worthy of detailed study for a proper background we might profit from the numerous studies of the "English Malady" which were composed by contemporary pathologists. Our sense of the reality of the general disorder will

be deepened also if we examine some of the numerous comments made upon the melancholy English in the letters of foreign visitors.

From another point of view, considerable attention is due the Chaucerian and antiquarian John Dart; his *Westminster Abbey. A Poem* (1721) preceded the publication of Parnell's *Night-Piece* and may therefore be regarded as a pioneer in the poetical fashion of taking readers to actual places of interment, which, after all, is the only distinctive characteristic of eighteenth-century poetry of death as compared with seventeenth. Dart selected for the *locale* of his moralizings the principal British Temple of Death. In this respect he had no immediate successors, for the cicerones who came after him preferred to visit the humbler dead; but he is not a negligible symptom in the evolution of the grave-yard *genre*. While religious sentiment and the religious counsels concerning death provide the main materials of literary melancholy, there were other, and less distressing, types of the mood. The most significant apparently was melancholy descriptions of nature. In this department of her work Miss Reed might well have consulted Professor Havens's two articles, "Literature of Melancholy" (*M. L. N.*, XXVII, 226) and "Romantic Aspects of the Age of Pope" (*P. M. L. A.*, XXVII, 297).

On the whole, Miss Reed's work is commendably accurate in detail. *A Pastoral Reflection on Death,* referred to as anonymous (p. 75), was published in 1691 under the name of the author, John Potenger. On p. 116 *Thebias* is misprinted for *Thebais*. The 1700 edition of Donne's *Biathanatos,* mentioned as the second (p. 82, note) was, I think, the third. But inaccuracies of this kind are very infrequent.

C. A. MOORE.

University of Minnesota.

William Austin, The Creator of Peter Rugg. Being a Biographical Sketch of William Austin, together with the Best of his Short Stories. Collected and Edited by his Grandson, Walter Austin. Boston, Marshall Jones Company, 1925.

The present work is the first extended biography of William Austin, the creator of Peter Rugg. In 1855 Evert A. Duyckinck

sketched the salient facts of Austin's life in the *Cyclopaedia of American Literature,* and in 1890 Austin's son, James, published his father's chief works, prefaced by a twelve-page summary of his life, under the title of *The Literary Papers of William Austin.* Using as nucleus for a new life the biographical facts presented in *The Literary Papers,* Walter Austin, William's grandson, has added a definite body of new material gleaned from contemporary documents, periodicals, and newspapers. The biographer also received valuable assistance from certain manuscript-notes preserved by his uncle, Arthur Williams Austin.

This work may perhaps be more accurately described as a compilation, than as a well unified biography. The source material used by Walter Austin has not always been employed to the best advantage. Long quotations and copious extracts from William Austin's works, unrelieved either by comment or summary, not infrequently suggest a lack of organization. This defect is particularly noticeable in the chapter on *Peter Rugg,* where contemporary and posthumous comment appear in bewildering confusion. The book as a whole, however, is far superior to the pious and adulatory biography ordinarily written by a son or relative of a distinguished man of letters, and easily surpasses such works as *The Literary Life of James K. Spaulding* by his son, William; and Pierre Irving's *Life and Letters of Washington Irving.* There is a certain accuracy particularly to the biographical chapters of the book that is refreshing to the scholar. The sources are throughout carefully documented, and abundant foot-notes, supplemented by a bibliography in the Appendix, make the book of decided value in a field where so much inaccurate and unscholarly work has been done.

Like many American authors during the first few decades of the ninteenth century, William Austin was in no sense a professional man of letters. His interest in literature was throughout his life that of the amateur who indulges a natural *penchant* for writing as a relaxation from the strain of business duties. So little, indeed, did he regard the products of his pen, that he promptly returned to Joseph Buckingham, editor of *The New England Galaxy* and *The New England Magazine,* all money sent him for contributions to those periodicals. Thus one looks in vain in the record of Austin's life for the struggle of a young author to attain literary recognition and distinction. Austin's biography concerns itself

rather with his career as a lawyer and politician. Soon after his graduation from Harvard in 1798, he was appointed chaplain in the Navy,—a post which he subsequently resigned to study law in England. Chapters entitled "Legal Career" and "Political Life" trace with some accuracy Austin's professional activities. The "Austin-Elliot Duel," the result of a political controversy, and an event in Austin's life the details of which he for many years sought to suppress, is also carefully described.

William Austin's literary reputation rests chiefly upon his tales, five in number. In *Peter Rugg, The Missing Man,* the first of the series, contributed to *The New England Galaxy,* for September 10, 1824, Austin made a permanent contribution to the legend literature of America. Employing the *motif* of the Wandering Jew or the Flying Dutchman, Austin produced a myth which successfully localized this curious legend in America. Told in a fragmentary manner, as the author now reports a conversation he has had with one who has seen Rugg, and now relates a personal experience with the mysterious man, the story possesses a vague, shadowy reality, suggestive of the supernatural appearances of this strange rider and his child. The tale shows the obvious influence of Rip Van Winkle in the bewilderment of Rugg, as he frequently comes in contact with men of a new generation.

The remaining tales are, upon the whole, less successful, and exhibit the weaker side of Austin as a story-teller. Humorous and satirical digressions often intrude themselves upon the narrative, and disturb the unity of the story. *The Man with the Cloaks,* another attempt to produce a local legend, shows these defects. Here didacticism and satire go hand in hand. Mr. Grindall, an old miser, refusing a cloak to a stranger in distress, soon afterwards becomes so cold, that he finds it necessary to add a cloak a day to his body, to keep himself warm. He is gradually cured of his malady by giving away one by one his many cloaks to needy persons. The satire of the tale concerns chiefly the disputing doctors who attend Grindall during his illness. As in *Peter Rugg,* a curse or prophecy serves as the starting point for the story.

In *Martha Gardner; or, Moral Reaction,* Austin portrays a widow relentlessly pursued by a corporation, which, though apparently successful in involving her in ruin, is ultimately defeated by her

moral force and persuasion. The situation here depicted was probably familiar to Austin as a lawyer, who levels much of his satire at the corporation. The story closes with an eloquent and effective curse.

The Late Joseph Natterstrom is another tale in which the satirical and didactic elements are uppermost. The story both satirizes in general the New York business man, and provides in particular for the ultimate reward of a righteous man after thirty years of hardship and apparent failure. The oriental background of the tale produces a curious atmosphere.

It is impossible to justify the existence of *The Sufferings of a Schoolmaster* except on the grounds of satire and burlesque. It is too exaggerated, forced, and positively ridiculous to serve even as propaganda against underpaid schoolmasters. A possible clue to Austin's purpose in writing the tale is contained in his own reference in the story to *Riley's Narrative,* which, he says, he has recently been reading. The work thus alluded to was published in 1817, and written by James Riley, a sea captain. The work purported to be "an authentic narrative of the loss of the American Brig Commerce, wrecked on the western coast of Africa, in the month of August, 1815, with an account of the sufferings of her surviving officers and crew." It is probable that in *The Sufferings of a Country Schoolmaster* Austin was burlesquing this and other similar works, wherein the sufferings of travelers are depicted in such glowing terms! The author may also have intended a fling at certain melodramatic qualities of the novels of Charles Brockden Brown.

With all their defects, and there are many, Austin's stories possess an atmosphere of their own, which quite defies analysis. It is undoubtedly true that these tales paved the way for the work of Poe and Hawthorne. In reprinting the stories of his grandfather, Walter Austin has performed a distinct service for students.

NELSON F. ADKINS.

Washington Square College,
New York University.

CORRESPONDENCE

MILTON AND THE *Physiologus*.

Milton in *Paradise Lost* twice at some length describes leviathan, first (1. 200-208) in a comparison with Satan lying on the fiery lake, and later (7. 410-416) in the catalogue of created things. The source of these passages, though editors of Milton seem to have missed it, and in several cases give erroneous explanations, is the ubiquitous *Physiologus*, that collection of moral tales based upon fabulous natural history, of which one chapter, too long to quote here,[1] uses the tale of a sea-monster, so huge as to be mistaken for an island, to point out the similar deceitful quality of the devil. I do not find the *Physiologus* anywhere cited as a source for any part of Milton; yet there is no doubt as to its connection with these passages. It is surely a book which Milton would be likely to know; indeed, in view of the widespread popularity of the collection, it would be strange if he had not come upon at least one of the many versions. Nothing could be more natural, therefore, than that, desiring a simile to mark the immensity of Satan, he should borrow the Naturalist's picture of the devil in the guise of the 'hugest of living creatures.'

One other interesting thing about these passages is their verbal similarity to the account of the 'whale' in the Old English *Physiologus*.[2] Just how extensive was Milton's knowledge of Old English would, indeed, be difficult to determine,[3] but, surely, if he had had the texts, he could have found a way to read them. The text of the Old English *Physiologus* lay in the Codex Exoniensis in Exeter Cathedral from about the middle of the eleventh century until 1841, when Thorpe published practically the entire codex. It is at least not impossible that Milton may have seen this manuscript, or even some other copy of the poem now no longer extant. The following similarities are arresting.

In the first place, the expression, 'swim the ocean-stream,' occurring near the beginning and setting the tone of the passage, while it may be, as one editor suggests, a reminiscence of 'Homer's ῥόος (or ποταμὸς) ὠκεάνοιο,' seems to me just such a compound as continually occurs in Old English. Moreover, it is almost a literal

[1] A translation of this chapter, together with a discussion of the whole *Physiologus*, will be found in the introduction to A. S. Cook's *The O. E. Phoenix, Elene, and Physiologus*, Yale University Press, 1919.

[2] Namely, ll. 1-23. The best text is Cook's, in the edition cited or, with two translations, in *Yale Studies in English LXIII.*

[3] The question—in connection with the resemblance between *P. L.* and the Cædmon *Paraphrase*—has more than once been discussed. Compare, e. g., for conflicting opinions, A. S. Cook, *Academy* 34. 402 and J. O. Westwood, *Academy* 35. 10 with R. P. Wuelker, *Anglia* 4. 401-405 and E. N. S. Thompson, *Essays on Milton* (Yale Univ. Press, 1914), p. 160, *et passim.*

translation of 'fyrgenstrēama geflotan,' and holds a position in Milton's passage corresponding to that of 'fyrgenstrēama geflotan' in the Old English poem. 'The pilot . . . , deeming some island, oft, as seamen tell, . . .' is very close to

swā þæt wēnaþ wǣgliþende
þæt hȳ on ēalond sum ēagum wliten.

'Deeming some island' is suspiciously like the over-compression of translation such as we find indulged in elsewhere by Milton [4] when he renders the Horatian 'credulus aureâ' by 'credulous, all gold,' a version which quite obscures the meaning. 'Scaly rind' is represented in the Old English by 'hīw gelīc hrēofum stāne.' The reference to Norway is easily explained by Milton's identification of the monster with the whale, but the presence of the Old English version might even more definitely have suggested northern seas, and, indeed, might have fixed more firmly in Milton's mind the popular idea of 'whale' as the equivalent of 'leviathan.' In the second passage from *Paradise Lost,* 'wallowing unwieldly' reminds us of Milton's liking for alliteration; and 'stretched like a promontory' and 'seems a moving land' lay stress upon the very detail which the Old English poet so conspicuously chooses for elaboration. Altogether, then, although these comparisons do not prove that Milton's source was not one of the Latin or Greek versions, yet, added to the strong resemblance in handling and in poetic tone, they make what seems to me a real probability that Milton may have seen the poem in its noble Old English version.

University of Indiana. JAMES HALL PITMAN.

SHAKESPEARE AND SENECA?

As to Seneca and Hotspur (*MLN,* XL, 380), cf. Nashe, *The Anatomie of Absurditie,* 1589 (Grosart, I, 18-19; McKerrow, I, 13-14):—" *Valerius in Epist. ad Ruf.* hath these words of a womans trecherous works. . . . Furthermore, in the same place he saith, *Quis muliebri garrulitati aliquid committit, quæ illud solum potest tacere quod nescit:* who will commit any thing to a womans tatling trust, who conceales nothing but that shee knowes not?" The passage is not in Walter Map's famous epistle *Dissuasio Valerii ad Rufinum philosophum ne uxorem ducat* (*De Nugis Curialium,* iv, 3-5; St. Jerome, *Opera,* Paris, 1706, v, 337-341).

As to Lady Percy and Seneca, cf. North's "Brutus" (ed. 1595, p. 1058).

G. L. KITTREDGE.

[4] Translation of Horace, *Carm.*, I. 5, included in any edition of Milton.

Three Generations of One Line

In stanza 102 of Henry More's *Praeexistency of the Soul* (*Philosophicall Poems,* Cambridge, 1647) is the line: "She is one Orb of sense, all eye, all airy ear." In *Paradise Lost* (vi, 350) Milton wrote: "All Heart they live, all Head, all Eye, all Eare." Finally we find a similar line in Shelley's *Queen Mab* (vi, 1): "All touch, all eye, all ear." Each of these passages contrasts the universal sense-organs of spirits with the limited perceptions of man, though with characteristic differences, for More was discussing the state of the human soul before it is imprisoned in the flesh; Milton, the state of angels and devils; and Shelley, the superhuman fairy queen.

There is no reason to assume that these parallels are mere coincidence. Newton, of course, referred Milton's line to Pliny's account of God (*Nat. Hist.,* i, vii): "totus est sensus, totus visus, totus auditus, totus animae, totus animi, totus sui." Milton certainly knew his classics, but none the less he could not have avoided reading the works of the Cambridge Platonist. And Shelley, as has been demonstrated in R. D. Havens's *Influence of Milton,* knew his Milton thoroughly, though this parallel is not included in Professor Havens's long list of parallels.

Harvard University. S. Foster Damon.

Reply to Mr. B. M. Woodbridge

In a recent issue of *Modern Language Notes,*[1] Mr. Woodbridge attacks my article on *The Romanticism of Guy de Maupassant.*[2] He suggests that I proposed *Don Juan* as a source for an episode in *Bel-Ami,* ignoring the fact that I said: "It is extremely unlikely that our author ever read *Don Juan.*"[3] Mr. Woodbridge admits readily that while *Bel-Ami* was not directly imitated from *Don Juan,* it belongs to the "*genus Don Juan,*" and such is precisely my contention.

Mr. Woodbridge thinks that the source of the episode in question is probably the scene between Emma and Léon in the cathedral at Rouen, as described in *Madame Bovary.* I made the same statement six years ago, in an article entitled *Literary Relationships of Guy de Maupassant.*[4]

O. H. Moore.

Ohio State University.

[1] xxxix, 3, pp. 185-187.
[2] *PMLA.*, xxxiii, 1, pp. 96-134.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 112.
[4] *MP.*, xv, p. 649. On the same page I note that I am anticipating the conclusions of the then unpublished thesis of Miss Agnes R. Riddell: *Flaubert and Maupassant, a Study in Literary Relationships.*

New Chaucer Items

In the recently printed *Calendar of Close Rolls* (1392-96) are three records relating to Geoffrey Chaucer which have seemingly never been printed. These documents will appear in the December number of *Modern Language Notes*.

E. P. Kuhl.

Goucher College.

"Alles für Ruhm und Ihr."

A very interesting example of the sovereign disregard with which Carlyle sometimes treated historical facts is found in his correspondence with Jane Welsh. From the very outset of their acquaintance Carlyle was deeply in love with the beautiful and proud girl from Haddington, who after a long courtship was to become his wife. Shyly he often expresses his admiration for her in phrases from foreign languages, mostly German. In a letter dated January 14th, 1822 we read: "I seem to have a motive and a rallying-word in the fight of life: when the battle is waxing fierce without, and the heart is waxing faint within, I shall remember it and do bravely. *Alles für Ruhm und Ihr!*" But this rallying-word was ill received by Jane Welsh. "*Alles für Ruhm und Ihr!!*," she replies, "On my word, most gay and gallantly said! One would almost believe the man fancies I have fallen in love with him, and entertain the splendid project of rewarding his literary labours with my self." Carlyle hastens to repair his mistake in the next letter: "I merely wish to say that when you read Schiller's History of the Thirty-Years War, you will like Bernhard von Weimar as much as I do. On going forth to fight beside Gustavus the Lion of the North, Bernhard wrote this epigraph on his standard: "*Alles für Ruhm und Ihr.*" And who was She? A great King's daughter, a brave King's Wife: and all the poor *Ritter* hoped for, was a smile from her fair countenance to greet his triumph, or a tear from her bright eyes to hallow his last and bloody bed. Perhaps it was all he wished."

There is no doubt that Carlyle either did not have Schiller's book at hand, or he trusted his memory too much to look up the corresponding page. Otherwise we would be at a loss to understand that even a Carlyle could make so many mistakes in so short a phrase. After reading the History of the Thirty-Years War Carlyle probably had a vivid picture of the brilliant and chivalrous Bernhard von Weimar in his memory and considered him as the originator of this gallant motto. To be sure it was the wild and dashing Christian von Braunschweig who was so in-

fatuated with the daughter of James I, the wife of the unlucky king Frederick of Bohemia, that he had his banners embroidered with the apothem "Tout pour Dieu et pour Elle"—long before Gustavus Adolphus set foot on German soil. In addition to this historical misinformation Carlyle, in quoting from Schiller who gives the correct German version "Alles für Gott und sie!," introduces two errors. The substitution of "Ruhm" for "Gott" may have been a deliberate change, making the motto pertinent to Carlyle's case. The use of the wrong case of the pronoun and its capitalization, however, are grave grammatical mistakes which surely would be censured in any examination paper in Beginning German.

Erwin Gustav Gudde.

University of California.

BRIEF MENTION

The Poems of Cuthbert Shaw and Thomas Russell, edited by Eric Partridge (Dulau and Co., London, 1925, 165 pp.). This attractive reprint makes accessible the work of two minor eighteenth-century poets who have hitherto not received the attention they deserve. One of them, indeed, Cuthbert Shaw, has been so neglected that Mr. Partridge was unable to find three of his pieces, —*Liberty, the Four Farthing Candles* (a satire on Churchill), and *Corruption.* It is to be hoped that copies of these works, all of which may have been published anonymously, will be discovered since the best thing that we have of Shaw's is a satire on the writers of his day, *The Race.* The *Monody* on his dead wife, though praised by his contemporaries, leaves us cold. On the other hand, some of Russell's sonnets are still very fine, perhaps the best produced in the eighteenth century. Nearly all his poems are of interest for one reason or another,—because of the catholicity of taste they exhibit, the austere, Greek beauty of one, the variously romantic charms of others, and because they recall now Collins, now Thomas Warton, now Spenser or Milton, and again Petrarch or Cervantes.

Mr. Partridge is unaware of recent American studies in the eighteenth-century sonnet and his few critical comments are not profound. Yet he has carefully assembled the available information concerning the two poets and has added some helpful notes—more would have been welcome. It is to be hoped that the sales of this book will warrant more reprints of the kind, the poems of the elder Thomas Warton, for example, or of Bampfield.

R. D. H.

The Modern Ibsen, by Hermann J. Weigand (New York, Henry Holt and Company. 1925). Professor Weigand has in a measure done for Ibsen's principal plays what A. C. Bradley did for Shakespeare's tragedies. He has made a most careful study of the text and arrived at interpretations which if sometimes startling are never ill-considered. His book is an illustration of the dictum that a work of genius is never too old to be reinterpreted. It is straight criticism of twelve plays with an avoidance of the so-called scholarly matter of biographical and bibliographical detail and of sources and influences with their attendant footnotes and references. With most of Weigand's interpretations the reader is bound, however unwillingly at first, to agree. The rating of *The Pillars of Society* as a play lacking the finesse of Ibsen's later art, of *Ghosts* as "unsurpassed in the world's literature for sheer tragic cruelty" we accept readily, especially when we see their qualities revealed in a searching analysis. His treatment of *A Doll's House* as "comedy of the subtlest order" is a clever piece of work, but I wonder if it does not prove too much. In his anxiety to show that Nora was still very much of a doll he almost makes her the heroine of a light comedy and ignores the results of her three days of concentrated agony. It is easy to emphasize the doll traits that remain; one does not develop into complete maturity in three days. To speak of the Nora who sat across the table in her final interview with her husband as "the superior [to Torvald] if erratic individual" is to reduce the scene to a commonplace family quarrel. The effect of the play on the stage is not that, and it is to be judged primarily by the reaction of the audience. And surely Weigand stretches the bounds of comedy when he makes it include *The Wild Duck.* To say that "it is comedy from start to finish [that] Ibsen injects tragedy into comedy to make comedy the more poignant" is almost equivalent to saying that Ibsen has changed comedy into tragedy. Remove Hedwig from the play and comedy remains, but with her in the action and her death the result of the well-intentioned blundering of Greger and the crass egotism of Hjalmar the comedy is so grim that it had better be called tragedy. I must say I cannot rise to the comic heights with Professor Weigand to see anything "droll" in the contrast between Hjalmar's silence in company and his airs at home when I think of the cowardly way he ignored his father, nor can I regard his treatment of Hedwig when after his return from the banquet he gave her a menu card instead of the promised delicacies as a "humorous exhibition . . . not without a sharp sting of pathos." There is no humour in cruelly disappointing a child. That she gets over it soon because she loves her putative father far beyond his deserts does not make the cruelty less intolerable in the eyes of the audience. In Weigand's own words, "tragedy pre-

supposes the dominance of sympathy, comedy of the mood of elation, if not laughter." Where is either elation or laughter in *The Wild Duck?* A particularly fine piece of criticism is the analysis of the thought and conduct of Tesman, the husband of Hedda Gabler, after Lövborg had lost his manuscript. One would suppose that Ibsen knew all that the psycho-analysts have since revealed of the workings of the human mind so accurately has he portrayed the involutions of Tesman's. In fact, the whole book is a demonstration of the essential greatness of Ibsen's dramatic art and of his penetrating analysis of the mind of man.

J. W. T.

X . . ., Docteur ès-Lettres. Les Variantes des Contemplations, Paris, Presses Universitaires, 1924. In 4°, 386 pages.

X . . ., Docteur ès-Lettres. Essai sur la Psychologie des Variantes des "Contemplations." Paris, Presses Universitaires, 1924. In 8°, 74 pages.

Il faut signaler aux étudiants de Victor Hugo ces deux thèses qui ne peuvent du reste suggérer, par leur nature même, aucune appréciation critique.

Ce sont des indications, ligne par ligne dans le premier volume, des variantes trouvées dans les poèmes des *Contemplations.* Des pages et des pages, des tables et des tables, avec, tout à la fin, quelques pages de notes (373-385), et à la dernière page (386) cinq vers inédits. De l'aveu de l'auteur,—d'après une 'note' pour la presse—la plus frappante révélation est que la pièce *A Villequier* avait d'abord pour titre *Un an après.*

La petite thèse n'est pas beaucoup plus révélatrice. Voici les phrases qui résument: "La plupart des variantes, quelque nombreux que soient les exemples contraires, marquent une réaction de l'intelligence sur la sensibilité" (p. 7). Cette réaction intellectuelle marque "effort vers la souplesse—vers l'ordre—vers la précision" (p. 8). Et lisons-nous encore: "Hugo, antithèse vivante, est un esprit brumeux qui tend vers la lumière. Il est né germanique, obscur . . ." (p. 8).

Veut-on un exemple de la "psychologie," voici sur *Le Revenant:*

"*Un jour, jour abhorré parmi les jours funèbres . . . .*

"a été remplacé par:

"*Un jour,—nous avons tous de ces dates funèbres!—*

"Pourquoi cette correction? Simplement pour éviter d'avoir

trois fois *jour* dans le même vers, et pour que la cheville, grâce à l'exclamation sensible, fût moins apparente, cheville nécessaire d'ailleurs, car après *Un jour,* il etait habile de gravement suspendre le récit pour un instant.

"Le résultat, c'est que même dans cette pièce pré-naturaliste l'allusion personnelle se glisse. Hugo semble dire à cette mère: —Insensée, qui crois que tu n'es pas moi!"

Thèse de doctorat certes très longue à faire;—mais facile.

A. S.

Students of Renaissance Latin will be interested in a reprint of Girolamo Fracastoro's dialogue *Naugerius, sive De Poetica,* with an English translation by Ruth Kelso and an introduction by Murray W. Bundy (*University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature,* Vol. IX, 1924. 88 pp. $1.00). The Latin text is a facsimile of the first edition of 1555. The translation offers a fairly reliable interpretation of the general meaning, though there are not a few errors in detail. For example, the pretty little song "Huc ades, o Thelayra," is almost ruined. As an appendix, the translator adds a few pages from Pontano's *Actius,* a dialogue on the same general theme. Here both the text and the translation should have been much more carefully revised. The introduction is a very serious study of the *Naugerius,* and of its place in the history of criticism. It is an "interesting attempt at synthesis of prevailing definitions of poetry." For Fracastoro, the aim of poetry is "not primarily ethical or scientific, but aesthetic."

W. P. M.

A useful collection of significant pages is brought together in Professor G. N. Henning's *Representative Stories of Anatole France* (D. C. Heath and Co., 1924). In spite of the dedicatory Invocation from *Sur la voie glorieuse,* duly acknowledged later in the notes, this is not an authorized edition, and the range of its selections is perforce limited by the agreement now observed by French and American publishers. But that range covers over thirty years: we have here *Abeille,* two chapters of *Le livre de mon ami,* three tales from *L'étui de nacre,* including *Le procurateur de Judée,* two episodes of *Pierre Nozière,* the reply of Pallas Athena from the address on Renan, *Crainquebille* and the story of Riquet with four characteristic pensées. A well-documented introduction presents the author chiefly as thinker and artist; but of course no static portrait, even in the Dutch manner, can give the student an idea of the changing romance of an intellectual evolution shown

in over half a century of published opinions. Four pages on the author's works follow the two paragraphs resuming his life: unfortunately, nothing is said about *La rôtisserie de la reine Pédauque, Le jardin d'Epicure, Le puits de sainte Claire, Clio, Histoire comique, Sur la pierre blanche, Les contes de Jacques Tournebroche, Les sept femmes de la Barbe-Bleue* and *La révolte des anges.* Maxima debetur puero reverentia! There are two portraits, including a photogravure of the fine bust by Jo Davidson, and several illustrations in muddy gouache, but the text, vocabulary and very full notes are all we should expect from the scholar who gave us the admirable *French Lyrics of the Nineteenth Century.*

Among inadvertences, a casual examination reveals the statement that the author was "Jewish by race" (xi) and that the *Légende de sainte Radegonde,* really lithographed for a few friends, was "printed" (xi); even with high school students in mind, some notes might have been omitted or at least relegated to the vocabulary: *e. g. Abeille* (199), *Bible* (204), *Judée* (208), *Moïse* (210), *Nazareth* (214), *Eve, Marie* (216), *arche de Noé* (222), etc. There are no notes for *renvoyer les enseignes* (106), *rouleaux, i. e.,* Hebrew scrolls of the Pentateuch (111), nor for *Je n'en jeûnai pas moins* (84) nor for the conditional with *que* (45, I. 18); and neither in notes nor vocabulary appear *synecdoche* (11), *euclase* (42), *rebec, timbales* (49), *indigète* (103), *franc* (146), although simpler cognates are often explained with as much detail as the historical allusions. These slight blemishes however will not detract from the usefulness of this carefully edited text-book.

L. P. S.

The publication of the first fascicule (*a-abord*) of the *Glossaire des patois de la Suisse romande* (Neuchâtel and Paris, Editions Victor Attinger, 1924; 6 fr. per fascicule) is an event of prime importance for Romance philology, and indeed for linguistics in general. The *Glossaire* is the result of twenty-five years of devoted work by four well-known scholars, Professors L. Gauchat, of Zurich, J. Jeanjaquet, of Neuchâtel, E. Tappolet, of Basle, and E. Muret, of Geneva. A number of preliminary publications, such as the *Bulletin du Glossaire des patois de la Suisse romande* (1902), the *Rapports annuels de la Rédaction* (1899-1924), the remarkable *Bibliographie linguistique de la Suisse romande* of Gauchat and Jeanjaquet (2 vols., Neuchâtel, 1912-20), and a notable series of monographs and dissertations have led linguists to look forward to a lexical work of unusual completeness and accuracy. The *Glossaire* fully meets such expectations. The personal collections of the editors, together with the reports of correspondents working on *questionnaires,* have furnished an unrivaled

body of material from surviving dialects. These sources are supplemented by copious excerpts from old and modern printed texts, so that the work avoids the one-sided use of spoken material characteristic of certain scholars. The progress so achieved is indicated by the fact the *Glossaire* when complete will contain more than 50,000 words, as against 8,000 in Bridel's *Glossaire du patois de la Suisse romande* (1866). The influence of modern methods appears in the abundant utilization of place-names and family names and of maps and illustrations drawn from photographs (the latter sometimes rather sketchy). The etymological notes, usually by Profesor Gauchat, are characterized by wide command of the literature, as well as by prudence and insight. The first fascicule contains detailed and valuable studies of peculiar manners and institutions in such articles as *abbaye, abeille, aberdzi.* For a custom in Wales, New England and New York analogous to the primitive usage described *s. v. aberdzi* cf. the references indicated in the *New English Dictionary, s. v. bundle, v.,* 5, and *bundling, sb.* The custom still exists among Swedish peasants. The verbs *abasta* and *abasti* and the related words are of interest, as Professor Gauchat remarked to the writer, as showing that **abbastare* (cf. *Romania,* XLIX [1923], 13) exists in the Franco-Provençal region.

D. S. B.

M. Jean Haust of the University of Liege has published in the *Almanach wallon* of 1924 (Editions gauloises, 9, rue Maximilien, Brussels; 6 frs.) *Pages d'anthologie wallonne, notices et traductions* (also separately, 3 fr.). This brochure of 37 octavo pages contains well-selected verses by nine poets, representative of eight varieties of Walloon. The booklet will be welcomed by all those desirous of some acquaintance with the most sharply marked and most widely cultivated of modern North French dialects. Helpful biographical and literary notes precede the extracts from each author. They are written with grace and insight. One is reminded on reading them that, despite popular misconceptions, linguistic studies need not blunt one's literary perceptions or sense of proportion. The translations are such as one would expect from a master of Walloon philology. As interest in Walloon literature in foreign countries is largely restricted to linguists, it might be well in a second and enlarged edition of this useful booklet to append brief statements of the distinguishing marks of each sub-dialect. Such notes would aid the reader in understanding the poems as well as in properly appreciating their language.

D. S. B.

Volume XL DECEMBER, 1925 Number 8

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

CONTENTS

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year — Single Copy (Current) Sixty-five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of Congress of July 16, 1894

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

This publication is devoted to linguistic and literary research and to æsthetic and philosophic criticism in the domain of English, German, and the related Germanic Languages; and of French, Italian, Spanish, and the other Languages of the Romance Group. Its purpose is also to promote sound methods in the teaching of the Modern Languages and Literatures.

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is $5.00 for the United States and Mexico; Canada $5.25 and $5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union.

Contributors and Publishers will please address matter for the English Department of the *Notes* to James W. Bright; for the German Department to William Kurrelmeyer; for the French Department to H. Carrington Lancaster; for the Italian and Spanish Departments to Gustav Gruenbaum. Other matter may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief. The address of all the editors is Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

PREPARATION OF COPY

All copy should be in typewritten form.

Underscore (for italics) all titles of books, periodicals, poems, plays and other separately published compositions.

Use numerals in designating foot-notes, and number foot-notes in unbroken sequence.

Use roman numerals for volume reference, set off by a comma before a following page-reference.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XL DECEMBER, 1925 NUMBER 8

ALDERMANN

A Supposed Anglicism in German

In German literature of the eighteenth century the word *Aldermann* occurs a number of times and has generally been looked upon as an adaptation of the English *alderman*. In the first volume of the *DWb*. Grimm says: "Aldermann, m. primarius, senator, im vorigen jh. nach dem engl. *alderman,* ags. *aldorman,* wider den sprachgeist eingeführt, der altermann fordert." *Weigand's Deutsches Wb.*[5] (1909) says: "Aldermann, M. Ältester in seiner Würde als Ratsherr oder überhaupt als Vorstand. Schon mhd. (in mitteld. Quellen) *aldirman,* aber erst wieder in den 70er Jahren des 18. Jh. auftauchend, und zwar entlehnt aus engl. *alderman* "Ratsherr," ags. *ealdorman,* "Fürst, Vornehmer." Paul in his *Deutsches Wb.*[2] (1908) simply states: "aus engl. *alderman* aufgenommen." Grimm's statement as to the English origin of the form *Aldermann* is repeated in deVries' *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* (1898) s. v. *olderman* and in the *Middelnederlandsche Woordenboek* of Verwijs and Verdam (1903) s. v. *ouderman.*

Klopstock first used the word in his *Gelehrtenrepublik,* 1774, which is Grimm's oldest reference. All other quotations given by Grimm go back to Klopstock's use with the possible exception of the one from Voss. Goethe's phrase "die biedersten Aldermannswahrheiten" is found in a letter to Schönborn, June 10, 1774, in which he gives an enthusiastic account of "Klopstocks herrliches Werk." Late in life, in the ballad *Der getreue Eckart* (1815) Goethe uses the word again:

> Und wenn euch, ihr Kinder, mit treuem Gesicht
> Ein Vater, ein Lehrer, ein Aldermann spricht,
> So horchet und folget ihm pünktlich!

Loeper in his commentary calls the word "Bildung Klopstocks nach dem englischen alderman" and refers to Grimm.

Voss uses the expression in the poem *Am Geburtstag* (1794):[1]

> Wir sehn den Aldermann
> Mit abgebleichten Haren.

In a note which Grimm evidently overlooked he states: "Aldermann, bei den sassischen Völkern Ältester, an Jahren, oder (wie Graf, Greve) an Amtswürde." To the Low German Voss it is a familiar word and title which he considers advisable to explain to his High German readers.

Klopstock's *Gelehrtenrepublik,* the literary starting point of the word in the eighteenth century, begins with the sentence: "Die Republik besteht aus Aldermännern, Zünften, und Volke." The section entitled "Von den Aldermännern" begins: "Die Aldermänner werden aus allen Zünften gewählt." In a note he states: "Aldermann ist ein altes deutsches Wort."[2] It is quite evident that Klopstock is not thinking of the English word *alderman,* which in the eighteenth century and to-day means "Ratsherr." If lexicographers had considered the connection in which the word is used so frequently in the *Gelehrtenrepublik,* they would not have concluded that Klopstock had taken over the English word *alderman.* "Aldermann," as used in the *Gelehrtenrepublik,* is indeed, as Klopstock says, an old German word, which for centuries had been used in various forms as name and title of the representative or head of a guild of merchants or craftsmen. The "Aldermänner" in the *Gelehrtenrepublik* are representatives of the "Zünfte" and chosen by them and from them. It is true the English word *alderman* was formerly used in exactly the same sense but that does not change the fact that Klopstock's "Aldermann" has centuries of German usage back of it. Klopstock doubtless knew the English word *alderman* in the sense of "Ratsherr," member of the city council, but in that sense the word is not used in the *Gelehrtenrepublik.*

It is possible, though not at all probable, that Klopstock knew the older meaning of the English *alderman,* i. e. head of a guild. In that sense, to be sure, the word was little used in the eighteenth

[1] *Sämmtliche Gedichte,* Königsberg, 1902, v, 68.

[2] *Klopstocks sämmtliche Werke,* Leipzig, Göschen, 1823, XII, 17.

century, it was practically obsolete. The last quotation for *alderman* = head or governor of a guild given in the NED belongs to the year 1649. Johnson's *Dictionary* (1755) has no reference connecting the word with the old guilds, but English-German and German-English dictionaries of the eighteenth century do give English *alderman* in the old sense of head of a guild. Cf. Ludwig, *Teutsch Englisches Lexicon,* 1716: "Altermann einer Gilde, der gildemeister an alderman of some guild." The phrase is also found in the edition of 1789. Ebers, *German-English Dictionary,* Leipzig 1796: "Alterleute in den Zünften und Ämtern . . . the Elders or Aldermen of some Guild or Fraternity. Altermann, der, einer Gilde, der Gildemeister, an alderman of a Guild." But even if Klopstock knew this older sense of the English *alderman* when he wrote the *Gelehrtenrepublik,* his "Aldermann" is not an adaptation from the English, but it is an old German word, as he declares himself, for the existence of which there is abundance of evidence.

Wieland in the opening lines of *Musarion* refers to Diogenes as "Aldermann der Cyniker," a quotation also given by Grimm. It is Klopstock's use of the word confirmed by the fact that the first editions of the poem of 1768 and 1769 do not contain it as they appeared before the *Gelehrtenrepublik.* It was inserted in a later edition.[3]

Adelung (1774) does not give the form "Aldermann," at the time he could not have known Klopstock's *Gelehrtenrepublik,* but he gives the High German "der Ältermann, plu. die Älterleute" and defines it as "derjenige der unter mehrern der älteste ist, und um deswillen gewisse Vorzüge vor andern geniesset. Besonders führen diesen Namen noch in Niedersachsen die Vorsteher der Kaufleute, Handwerker oder anderer Innungen, welche sonst auch Älteste, Oberälteste, Handwerkmeister, imgleichen Altermannschaften genannt werden. An einigen niedersächsischen Orten belegt man auch die Kirchenvorsteher mit diesem Namen." In a note he refers to the Anglo-Saxon *Ealderman* and continues: "Übrigens ist dieses Wort nur allein in Niedersachsen und den damit verwandten Sprachen üblich. Nieders. Olderman, Engl. alderman, Schwed. Ålderman, Dän. Oldermand." He concludes with a reference to the glossaries of Spelman and Haltaus.

[3] Cf. *Wielands Werke,* Berlin, 1909, 1. Abt., VIII, 179.

Campe in his *Wörterbuch* (1807) refers under "Aldermann" to Ältermann: "besonders im Niederdeutschen (wo man auch häufig das Englische Aldermann dafür zu gebrauchen pflegt) ein Vorsteher der Kaufleute, Handwerker oder anderer Innungen, sonst Ältester, Oberältester, Handwerksmeister und Ältermannschaft genannt. In einigen Gegenden heissen so auch die Kirchenvorsteher. Dann uneigentlich, die Ältermänner in der gelehrten Welt, in den Geschäftskreisen, alte verdienstvolle Gelehrte und Geschäftsmänner (Veteranen)." He quotes from one of his own works: "Nur etwas weniger Kälte und Gleichgültigkeit von Seiten der Ältermänner unsers gelehrten Freistaats." He uses here "Ältermänner" in exactly the same sense as Klopstock's "Aldermänner," but purist that he was, he avoids Klopstock's form which he believed to be English.

Heyse-Lyon's *Fremdwörterbuch* (1896) gives under "Aldermann" first the English meaning, then continues: "auch früher in Deutschland aus dem Englischen herübergenommene Bezeichnung eines Ortsrichters, Ältesten, Ratsherrn: Aldermann z. B. in Goethes getreuem Eckart."

Sanders, frequently so unreliable in his etymologies, is the only one of modern lexicographers who is clearly aware of the Low German origin of the form. Under "Aldermann" he refers to "Altermann" which he defines as "Vorsteher, Ältester," with a quotation from Eichhorn, *Deutsches Privatrecht* (1845) p. 900: "Die Gerechtsame der Zunft werden durch ihre Vorsteher (Zunftmeister, Obermeister, Gildemeister, Altermänner) ausgeübt." He refers to Adelung's "Ältermann" and continues: "Häufig in ursprünglich niederdeutscher Form, der Aldermann." His quotations for this form are the same as in Grimm.

The view of the English origin of "Aldermann" seemed to be corroborated in the eighteenth century by the fact that many translators of English works rendered the English *alderman* in the sense of Ratsherr by "Aldermann," plu. "Aldermänner." It was not really a translation but merely the taking over of an English word with a German ending. A few examples of this careless manner must suffice. Swift's *Märchen von der Tonne,* Altona, 1729, p. 97: "es haben sowol die Alten als auch die Neuern die Anmerckung gemacht, dass ein rechter Criticus einer Hure und einem Aldermanne gleichet, und seine Titel, oder seine Natur

niemals ableget." The same passage we find in Gottsched's *Neuer Büchersaal der schönen Wissenschaften* III, 278 (1746) according to Reichel's *Gottsched Wörterbuch.* Gottsched also speaks of London's "Aldermänner." [4] Waser's translation of Butler's *Hudibras* (1765) p. 415: "wie Aldermänner (like aldermen)"; Sterne's *Tristram Shandy,* Berlin, 1771, 8. Theil, p. 114: "drey bis vier Aldermänner"; Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliette,* I, 4: "on the fore-finger of an alderman," Wieland translates: "Am Zeigfinger eines Aldermanns," the anonymous translation of Basel 1758: "an eines Aldermannes Zeigefinger"; Schlegel retained the word. This rendering of *alderman* became so common in the eighteenth century that Adelung in the second edition of his *Wörterbuch* (1793) felt moved to add a note to his article on Ältermann: "Das englische *alderman* bedeutet vorzüglich einen Rathsherren, und wird von ungeschickten Übersetzern immer durch das im Hochdeutschen unbekannte Aldermann gegeben, da sie es doch durch Rathsherr übersetzen sollten."

At times the English word is given together with the German equivalent as in G. W. Alberti's *Briefe betreffend den allerneuesten Zustand der Religion und der Wissenschaften in Grossbritannien,* Hannover, 1752, p. 1197: "nach dem Bürgermeister folgen die Rathsherren oder Aldermen," or in Ebert's translation of Young's *Satires,* Braunschweig, 1771, p. 52, note: "wie die Aldermen oder Rathsherren in London." Occasionally we find the German form "Ältermann" or "Altermann" which, as will appear later, is not the exact equivalent of English *alderman.* Cf. *Das Neu-Beharnischte Gross-Britannien,* Nürnberg, 1690, p. 613: "dem Herrn Major . . welcher ein sehr schönes Kleid . . wie auch die Aeltermänner und Schöpffen ihre Scharlachene Röcke anhatten; ib. p. 616: "der Lord Major von Londen . . und die Aeltermänner." Page 578 we find the phrase: "die Altermänner, wie man sie nennet" in reference to the *aldermen* of London. Evidently "Altermänner" in this sense was not a current expression to the author. The translator of the *Tatler* [5] explains the German "Aeltermann" which he uses for the English *alderman,* I, 522, note: "Die eigentliche Stadt London ist in Quartiere oder in Wards getheilet, deren jedes seinen Aeltermann oder Schöppen

[4] Reichel *ib. s. v.* Aldermann.

[5] *Der Schwätzer,* Leipzig, 1756.

hat, und dieser Schöppe wird von den Bürgern dieser Quartiere . . gewählet." For him also "Aeltermann" is a makeshift translation, i. e. he uses a similar word with a German connotation to render the English *alderman*. In the plural he uses "Aelterleute" I, 522; on p. 546 he uses "Schöppe" for *alderman*. Ludwig's *Teutsch Englisches Lexicon* 1716 has "ein ältermann zu Londen in England, ein Rathsherr daselbst, an alderman of London." Encyclopedic dictionaries of the eighteenth century record *alderman* as an English word and give its correct meaning. Jablonski's *Allgemeines Lexicon der Künste und Wissenschaften* (Leipzig, 1721) says under "Aldermann": "Also heissen in Engelland die rath-manne in den städten . ." Zedler's *Universal Lexicon* (1732) gives "Alderman" as an Anglo-Saxon word referring to Spelman's *Glossary*. At the end of the short article we read: "In London sind itzo 26 Aldermans, welche nebst dem Ober-Bürger-Meister, oder Lord-Major, den Rath ausmachen." Jäger's *Zeitungs-Lexicon* (Nürnberg, 1782): "Alderman, bedeutet im Englischen so viel als Rathsherr."

The practical identity of form of English *alderman* and German "Aldermann" and the similarity of meaning account in part for the assumption of later lexicographers that German "Aldermann" was taken over from the English *alderman*.

The Low German "Aldermann" or more commonly "Oldermann" and, to a lesser extent, the High German "Altermann" were widely used during the Middle Ages down to modern times, though Grimm gives only one reference for "Altermann." In Low German the word has two chief usages, it is applied to the head or representative of a fraternity or guild of merchants or craftsmen, or it is applied to the lay directors or wardens of a church, hospital or similar institution. The first usage corresponds exactly to the old use of the English *alderman*. As the heads of the guilds, especially the merchant guilds, in many places became members of the city government, the word "Aldermann" acquired at times the meaning of a representative of the city government. That was regularly the case in England, so that English *alderman* in course of time acquired the exclusive meaning of member of the city government surviving the disappearance of the guilds (cf. *NED*.). In Germany there always seems to have been a difference between the "Ratsherrn," the regular members

of the city council, and the representatives of the guilds, hence "Aldermann" never came to be the equivalent of "Ratsherr."[6] In Berlin in the fourteenth century the two heads of the city government elected by the city council were called "Olderlude," later their title was "Burgermeister."[7]

Both the Low German and the English forms occur frequently in Latin documents as *aldermannus*. DuCange knows *aldermannus* only as Latinized Anglo-Saxon, his examples are chiefly taken from Spelman's *Archæologus*, London, 1626, to which reference is made. In the Henschel-Favre edition of 1883 we also find *aldermannus* as guild word: "judex Gildae Oxoniensis, seu qui mercatorum lites dijudicabat." The Latinized form must also have favored the assumption that the German was derived from the English.

The term plays an important part in the history of the Hanseatic League. It is first found in its Latin form in the signature to a document dated 1251: "Arnaldo Thedmar. aldermanno Theutonicorum";[8] again in 1260: "Arnulpho filio Thedmari aldermanno mercatorum Alemanie in Angliam veniencium."[9] Though both documents were made out in London, it is not to be supposed for a moment that the Hanseatic merchants borrowed the term from the English. It must have been an old word with them.

The last mentioned document has among other signatures that of "Michale Tany, aldremmano illius warde," i. e. an Englishman who was alderman of the ward. In other words, in the body of the document we have *aldermannus* in its Hanseatic or Low German sense, the representative of the corporation of merchants, in the signatures we have *aldermannus* in the English sense, the representative of one of the wards of the city of London. But as English "alderman" at that time could also be used for the

[6] In Low German Oldermann has survived to quite recent times in certain North German cities like Stralsund, Greifswald, Wolgast in connection with the medieval terminology of the guilds. Herr Oldermann, Fru Ollermann were common titles. Cf. Berghaus, *Sprachschatz der Sassen*, Berlin, 1884, s. v. Oldermann.

[7] Cf. Maurer, *Geschichte der Städteverfassung in Deutschland*, Erlangen, 1869, I, 624.

[8] *Hansisches Urkundenbuch*, ed. Höhlbaum, Halle 1876, no. 405.

[9] *Ib.*, no. 540.

representative of a corporation of merchants, no difference in meaning could have been felt.

Aldermannus occurs a few years later in a document sent by the city of Lübeck to its representative in the island of Gotland in the Baltic: "domino aldermanno civitatis Lubycensis constituto in Gotlandia." [10] A document dealing with conditions at Nowgorod in Russia dated 1268 refers to "oldermanno de Engeren" and to "oldermanno vectorum, qui dicuntur vorschkerle." [11] A Low German document issued in the name of the Russian king Jeretslawe at Nowgorod in 1269 contains the words "midh dhen oldermannen unde mid al dhen Norgordiren," where "oldermannen" refers to Russians.[12] The word is naturally very common in the official records and documents of the Hanseatic towns, its Latin form being usually *aldermannus,* occasionally *oldermannus,* its German form *oldermann,* plural *oldermanne* or more frequently *olderlüde, -lude,* at times also *aldermann.* "aldermanne unde bysitters" we find in the *Lübecker Ratschronik* of the fifteenth century.[13]

In Hamburg the use of the term seems originally to have been confined to the head or heads of the merchant guild, later it was extended to the heads of other guilds. Rüdiger in his *Die ältesten Hamburgischen Zunftrollen und Brüderschaftsstatuten* (Hamburg, 1874) says, p. 331: "Oldermann, pl. Olderlude, oldermanne, sind ursprünglich nur die Vorsteher des Kaufmanns, später auch der kirchlichen Brüderschaften und der zünftigen Brüderschaften. Seit dem Ende des 15. Jh. ist Aeltermann auch gleich Werkmeister." The word occurs repeatedly in Rüdiger's collection of documents, e. g. p. 48: "To dem ersten scholen se (i. e. die Krämerzunft) kesen twe bedderve man to oldermannen ute ereme ampte" (1375); p. 302: "de olderlude der wandtschnider" (1588). In the oldest statutes of the city of Bremen of the year 1303 we read of "en olderman" in connection with "ratman," probably the representative of the merchants in the city government, later in the *Statuta Bremensia* of 1428 we meet "de veer oldermans des copmans unde de veer oldermans der ammete" (i. e. Hand-

[10] *Ib.*, no. 593.
[11] *Ib.*, no. 663.
[12] *Ib.*, no. 665.
[13] Cf. *Deutsche Städtechroniken,* XXXI, 174.

werkszünfte).[14] The form "Alderlude" (des gemeynen coepmans von der Duytschen hanze) occurs in a Bremen document of 1410.[15] A decree of the city council of Hildesheim of the year 1345 begins: "We, all dre . . rade, de olde unde de niyge rad, de olderlůde und alle inninghe."[16] In documents of 1451 "olderlude der cremergilde" are mentioned, also "olderlude der smede."[17] In the sixteenth century we find in Hildesheim an "olderman der gemeinheit" by the side of the burgomaster: "wy olderman der gemeinheit der Oldenstadt to Hildesheim bekennen" (1549);[18] "wir burgermeister, radt, vier und zwantzig man, olderman der gemeinheit, vier ambte und finf gilde der lobligen sambtreigierunge" (1585).[19] In a document of the city of Halberstadt dated 1483 we find the form "alderman" used as family name: "der Bürger zu Blankenburg Curd Alderman."[20]

The second use of the word as name and title of the lay wardens of churches and hospitals is also very common. The oldest reference to this meaning seems to be an ecclesiastical document at Magdeburg dated 1266 given in Haltaus' *Glossarium Germanicum* (Leipzig, 1758): "Layci parrochialium ecclesiarum provisores seu vitrici, qui altirmanni vulgari vocabulo nuncupantur." From Thuringian and Missnian documents Haltaus quotes "ein werltlich alterman" (1384); "provisoribus et altirmannis ecclesie S. Petri" (1449); "ex vitricis sive Altermannis" (1483); from Low German territory he gives: "twene oldermenne schulleth . . den Hospital . . truwelcken vorstan" (Hildesheim 1463); "oldermanni sive Provisores leprosorii" (1466); etc. In fact Haltaus gives the word only in this sense: "Altermänner in Saxonia Inferiore Olderluede, Altermanni, Seniores, Curatores, et Provisores Laici Templorum, Hospitalium etc." In Doebner's *Urkundenbuch der Stadt Hildesheim* (1881) the word occurs frequently

[14] Cf. G. Oelrichs, *Vollständige Sammlung alter und neuer Gesez-Bücher der . . Stadt Bremen*, Bremen, 1771, pp. 17, 19, 398.

[15] Cf. Ehmke und Bippen, *Bremisches Urkundenbuch*, Bremen, 1886, I, 545.

[16] Cf. Doebner, *Urkundenbuch der Stadt Hildesheim*, 1881, I, 551, no. 948.

[17] *Ib.*, VII, 27 and 30.

[18] Doebner, VIII, no. 888.

[19] *Ib.*, VIII, 828.

[20] Cf. G. Schmidt, *Urkundenbuch der Stadt Halberstadt*, Halle 1879, no. 1102.

in this sense, first in the year 1361: "den olderluden der kerken to sente Andrease" (II, 108). Cf. also "de olderlude des hospitalis" 1496 (VIII, 285), "den olderluden sancti Lamberti" 1502 (VIII, 376), etc. It is found in Braunschweig: "mit den vormunderen unde alderluden der goddeshuse" (1404).[21] Brinckmaier's *Glossarium diplomaticum* (1856) gives several other passages in addition to some found in Haltaus.

When High German began to replace Low German in the documents of Northern German cities in the sixteenth century, "Aeltermann" and "Aelterleute" were used for the Low German "oldermann" and "olderlüde," occasionally also "Altermann" and "Alterleute." The High German statutes of the *Rad- und Stellmacher Brüderschaft* in Hamburg dated 1599 give the form "Elterleute" or "Älterleute."[22] A decree of the city council of Bremen dated 1678 has "von etlichen Elterleuten des ehrsamen Kaufmann" and "Eltermanns Eid."[23] A Hamburg statute of 1641 speaks of "Alter-Leuten der Schiffer";[24] and a High German document of the seventeenth century refers to "den dreien Alter-Leuten in jedem Carspel (Kirchspiel).[25] Wachter[26] refers under "Aldermannus" to "Eltermann" which is for him the regular High German form, while Haltaus (1758) records the word under the form "Altermänner." Stieler (1691) gives "Altermann" and says: "hodie Altermänner sunt rectores vel seniores collegiorum, penes quos est directio et auctoritas. Sax. Oldermann, praeses mercatorum est." The statement is taken verbatim from Schottel's *Teutsche Haubt Sprache* (1663), p. 288, who registers the word under the form "Altermann." Frisch (1741) gives the form "Alter-Mann" with the meaning "ein Alt-Meister bey einigen Hand-Werckern, als der Mäurer." He also refers to the use of "Olderlude" in the city of Braunschweig as "curatores templorum" and refers to Spelman's *Glossary* for

[21] Cf. *Deutsche Städtechroniken*, v. 16, p. lxii.

[22] Cf. Rüdiger, *Die ältesten Hamburger Zunftrollen*, etc. Hamburg 1874, pp. 196, 199.

[23] Cf. J. H. Duntze, *Geschichte der freien Stadt Bremen*. Bremen 1846, IV, 247.

[24] Cf. N. Staphorst, *Hamburgische Kirchengeschichte*. Hamburg 1727. Part I, III, 724.

[25] *Ib.*, Part II, I, 170.

[26] *Glossarium Germanicum*. Leipzig 1737.

the old sense of the word. The *Bremisch-Niedersächsische Wörterbuch* (1768) gives "Aelterleute" as High German equivalent of "older-lüde."

Modern historians seem to prefer the form "Älterleute," though there is no uniform usage. J. H. Duntze in his *Geschichte der freien Stadt Bremen* (1845) uses "Aeltermann" and "Aelterleute" as modern forms of the Low German name.[27] Lappenberg in his *Hamburgische Urkundenbuch* (1842) uses "Aeltermann" I, 593 etc.; in his *Urkundliche Geschichte des Hansischen Stahlhofs* (1851) he has "Altermann," pp. 12, 14, 15, 16, etc.; "Altermannen," pp. 16, 17, 19, etc.; but also "Alderman," p. 4. Koppmann in his book *Leitfaden für die Aelterleute des deutschen Kaufmanns in Brügge* (Hamburg 1875) uses the form given in the title. Sartorius in his *Urkundliche Geschichte des Ursprungs der deutschen Hanse* (1830) uses "Altermänner" I, 13, but also the Low German form "Oldermann" I, 7, 10. Höhlbaum in his *Hansisches Urkundenbuch* (Halle 1876, 2. vs. 1879) uses "Aldermann"; cf. the headlines in v. I, no. 673, 1036, 1354; II, no. 40; also "Aelterleute" I, 345; Ehmke and Bippen, *Bremisches Urkundenbuch,* 1886, I, 480: "Elterleute der Deutschen Hanse zu Brügge"; Doebner, *Urkundenbuch der Stadt Hildesheim* (1881): "Älterleute" VIII, 8; Maring, *Diözesansynoden . . . des Stiftes Hildesheim* (1905), p. 51: "Die Älterleute . . sind die Vorläufer unserer Kirchenvorsteher." The forms "Ältermann" and "Älterleute" are not given in Grimm, Sanders, Heyne or Weygand, but they are found in a number of German and bilingual dictionaries of the first half of the nineteenth century which still show the influence of Adelung.

"Altermann" or "Ältermann" is not found, so far as I can see, in the old guild statutes of High German cities. Other expressions were used for the representatives of the guilds. "Aldermann" or "Oldermann" as guild word was evidently confined to Low German usage. Later, with the disappearance of Low German as official language, the High German "Altermann" or "Ältermann" first used in North German documents came into general use. "Altermann" as name of the wardens of churches or hospitals seems to have been High German from the very beginning; cf. the examples given by Wachter.

[27] Cf. I 501, II 480, and Index.

The word is also found in Frisian. According to Richthofen's *Altfriesisches Wörterbuch* (1840) *aldirmon* is a well established Old Frisian word in the sense of "judge" forming compounds like *bur-aldirmon* and *dik-aldirmon.* It occurs in the laws of Rüstringen of which the oldest manuscript belongs to the end of the thirteenth century. It is found as guild word in a "*Kalendbrüderschaft*" at Levenwolden in 1450. Frisian cities were governed by men bearing that title; "Aldermanni gronienses" is found in a Groningen document dated 1258; "die alderman myt sine schepen" is found in a document of Leeuwarden 1456. Wiarda's *Altfriesisches Wörterbuch* (Aurich 1786) also records Old Frisian *alderman,* explaining it as "Eltermann, Syndicus."

According to the *Friesch Woordenboek* of Dijkstra and Hettema (Leeuwarden 1900) "âlderman" is still used in Frisian: "Hy is âlderman, von iemand die in een gezelschap of bij een werk de meeste ervaring heft." Cf. also H. Molema, *Wörterbuch der Groningenschen Mundart im 19. Jh.* (1888) s. v. *olderman.*

As guild word we find the Low German "alderman" in various forms in Dano-Norwegian and Swedish. It even passed into late Old Norse. The Hansa played a great part in the Scandinavian countries and the organizations of the tradesmen there were originally largely in the hands of German artisans. Molbech's *Dansk Glossarium* (Kopenhagen 1857) gives "Aldermand" as the older Danish form which later became "Oldermand." It was formerly also used in the sense of "radhman": "Romerske Radhman eller alderman" (1488). Cf. also *Dansk Ordbog* (Kopenhagen 1826), s. v. Oldermand. Jessen in his *Dansk Etymologisk Ordbog* (Kopenhagen 1893), calls it a loan word from the Low German "Alderman" which he believes to be = English *alderman,* Anglo-Saxon *ealdorman.* In Swedish the form is *ålderman,* Old Swedish *alderman,* for which Söderwall in "*Svenska Medeltids Språk*" (Lund 1884) gives many references.[28] Hellquist[29] derives it from MLG. Cf. also Falk-Torp, *Norwegisch-Dänisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch.*

In Dutch the word is as old and was as common as in Low

[28] The rare form with *s* "aldersman" (cf. Dahlgren, *Glossarium öfver föraldrade eller ovanliga Ord och Talesätt,* 1914-16) seems to be a different formation.

[29] *Svensk Etymologisk Ordbok.* Lund 1922.

German. DeVries' *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* (1893) gives the following explanation of the use of Dutch "ouderman" (also "olderman"): "Oude benaming van verschillende overheidspersonen in de Friesche en Saksische landstreken, hetzij rechters, vertegenwoordigers der gemeente in stadsregeeringen, of hoofden van gilden en ambachten." These uses agree, as we might expect, with those found in Low German except that there is no mention of "ouderman" in the sense of warden of a church or hospital. In Groningen deVries finds the term used for the governors of the city as early as 1255 and at Leeuwarden in Friesland there is an "alderman" or "olderman" at least since 1190.

The last mentioned date 1190 seems to be the oldest reference to the use of the word on the continent. In England *ealdor-man* is found at least three centuries earlier. Nevertheless the continental term is not borrowed from the Anglo-Saxons, it is an independent formation and must be much older than the twelfth century. It is a comparative formation, an explanation on which most etymologists agree. The O. E. *ealdor-man* is generally taken as a compound of the noun *ealdor*[30] and *man,* though it must have early been felt as a comparative formation. The High German "altermann" as found in the Thuringian and Missnian documents given by Haltaus also shows the comparative but without umlaut.

In choosing the form "Aldermann" instead of the far more common "Oldermann" Klopstock doubtless followed the written usage of older times. He was interested in the use of old German words and "Aldermann" was such a word. He might possibly have been influenced also by the modern form "Aldermann" which he might have heard, for in certain parts of the Low German territory Germanic *a* before *ld* had not changed to *o*.[31] The unusual and in a way artificial High German form 'Aldermann" must have appeared to Klopstock more dignified and more poetic than the common Low German "Oldermann" with its prosaic associations.

John A. Walz.

Harvard University.

---

[30] For the suffix cf. Kluge, *Nominale Stammbildungslehre,* § 30.

[31] Cf. Lasch, *Mittelniederdeutsche Grammatik,* § 93; Kosegarten, *Wörterbuch der niedersächsischen Sprache.* Greifswald 1856, s. v. ald.

SHAKESPEARE'S MOIETY OF THE STRATFORD TITHES

The two extant documents which deal with Shakespeare's acquisition of 'the moiety or one half' of certain Stratford tithes are long and cumbrously legal in their phraseology. They run to nearly ten thousand words, and in the only place in which they are printed in full,[1] they are given in eye-destructive small type. Their interest to biographers of Shakespeare is not obviously great, and it is not unnatural that modern writers have contented themselves with brief summaries of their purport which appear to be in several respects inconsistent and inaccurate. An examination of the text of the documents makes it possible (1) to explain more precisely than, I believe, has been done both what the nature of the property was that Shakespeare held and what his motives were in associating himself with Richard Lane and Thomas Greene in a chancery petition concerning the tithes; and also (2) to date the petition, which has heretofore been conjecturally assigned to various years between 1609 and 1612.

Mrs. Stopes writes (*Shakespeare's Environment,* 1914, p. 82): "Dr. Ingleby is entirely wrong in his account of the tithes, which were not owned only by Shakespeare and Greene. They were sold by Sir John Huband (*sic*) [2] in 1605, either directly or indirectly, to a large number of holders, among whom was Shakespeare, who was said to hold a 'moietie'; but this by no means represented a half, as we might be inclined to read it, even of the tithes, and the 'property' consisted, beyond the tithes, of houses, cottages, and fields." Sir Sidney Lee remarks very similarly (*Life of Shakespeare,* 1922, p. 320): "Although loosely called a 'moiety,' Shakespeare's share of 'the tithes'—a miscellaneous property including houses, cottages, and fields—scarcely amounted to a quarter. . . . When Shakespeare acquired his 'moiety' the property was divided among over thirty local owners in allotments of various dimensions. . . . It (Shakespeare's portion) far exceeded in value all the others save one." Professor Adams says (*Life of Shakespeare,* 1923, 388): "Barker had disposed of the lease to other parties, so that by the time Shakespeare made his purchase, the tithes were

[1] Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines*, 7th ed., 1887, ii, pp. 19-25, 25-31.

[2] Sir John Huband was dead in 1598; it was his brother, Ralph, who sold the tithes to Shakespeare.

distributed among approximately forty owners. Shakespeare's portion—it was relatively large, consisting of more than a quarter of the whole—was estimated to bring him in annually the sum of £60."

The documents make it clear that the repeated words, 'moiety or one half,' are not loosely used, but refer to a precise half of a particular property. They indicate also who owned the other half, and show that Shakespeare's holdings were valued at almost exactly one-eighth of the entire estate. The history of the Stratford tithes, as recapitulated both in Shakespeare's purchase-deed and in the later complaint in chancery, has been variously narrated. The essential facts are these.

In 1544, near the close of Henry VIII's reign, the old ecclesiastical body known as the 'College,' or Collegiate Church of Stratford-upon-Avon, was in possession of much property in the counties of Warwick and Worcester, consisting of glebe lands, parsonsages and other buildings, and also tithe-rights—*i. e.,* the claim to one-tenth the annual produce of hay, grain, lambs, wool, etc.—over a wide district which included, not merely Stratford-upon-Avon proper, but also Old Stratford, Welcombe, Bishopton, and various other villages. Perhaps as a precaution against state interference or confiscation, the Warden and chapter of the so-called 'college,' in the year named, leased to William Barker of Berkshire (a namesake and perhaps relative of the Warden) all their properties "in the county of Warwick or Worcester, or elsewhere, whatsoever they be," excepting only the mansion house and site of the college itself.[3] The period of the lease was 92 years and the consideration an annual payment by Barker and his heirs of £122, 18*s.* 9*d.* The 'College' was very shortly abolished, but the lease held. Edward VI, in 1553, granted the reversion of the property, when the lease should expire in 1636, to the municipal corporation of Stratford, to which in the meantime was to be paid the rent provided for. John Barker inherited the lease from William, and in 1580 transferred it to Sir John Huband, stipulating for an annual rent of £27, 13*s.* 4*d.* for himself—in addition, of course, to the amount payable to the Stratford authorities. When Sir John died, the whole property as leased by the 'College' to William

[3] **This was acquired in 1596 by Thomas Combe (of whom more later) by grant from Queen Elizabeth, and served for his residence.**

Barker, had already been broken up by sub-leases to different parties, but a rent-roll for Stratford in 1598 [4] notes that "the executors of Sir John Huband do hold all manner of tithes of corn, grain, and hay in the towns, hamlets, villages, and fields of Old Stratford, Welcombe, and Bishopton, and all manner of tithes of wool, lamb, hemp, flax, and other small and privy tithes, for the yearly rent (*i. e.,* to the Stratford corporation) of £34"

The meaning is that Huband's estate continued to hold the corn, grain, and hay-tithes for the three districts specified, and tithes of wool, lamb, etc. for the whole parish. The ratio of the rent paid for this to the total of £122, 18s. 9d. indicates that its value was set at slightly over a quarter of that of the original property. It was the 'moiety or one half' of this particular quarter which Shakespeare purchased, in July, 1605, for £440 from Ralph Huband, to whom his brother, Sir John, had bequeathed it. Shakespeare's deed makes this clear and provides that he is to pay annually for his moiety seventeen pounds (half of £34) to the bailiff and burgesses of Stratford, and also "the one-half of ten pounds by year, to be paid to the said John Barker"—ten pounds being the sum assessed against Sir John Huband's estate toward the £27, 13s. 4d. which Barker claimed from the property as a whole. Shakespeare later thought this assessment disproportionately high, as it seems to have been.

About three years and a half [5] after he bought his share in the tithes, Shakespeare joined with two other lease-holders, Richard Lane and Thomas Greene, in a bill of complaint in the chancery court. The point is there made that, except in the case of Shakespeare's share and its complementary moiety (each of which is charged five pounds), no scale has been worked out to determine how much each of the many persons who now hold portions of the old 'College' property should contribute towards the £27, odd, due annually to Barker. Many of these others pay nothing at all, and some wilful and influential persons, such as Lord Carewe of Clopton, openly scoff at payment. The result is that Shakespeare and the other petitioners have had to pay more than their share in order to safeguard their interests, since a strict interpretation

[4] Quoted by Halliwell-Phillipps in a note (*Outlines,* 7th ed., ii, 348), but apparently overlooked by some later writers.

[5] The evidence for this date is given later.

of Barker's lease would permit him to foreclose upon the entire property if any part of his rent were unpaid. The petition asks that the refractory lessees be disciplined by the court and a commission appointed to assess each man fairly *pro rata,* and that Barker be allowed to proceed, in case of non-payment, only against the delinquent individuals.

The paper gives a detailed list of all the persons who were at the time possessed of any part of the old 'College' property, with a general description and estimate of the yearly value of each holding. When tabulated it makes clear Shakespeare's position with reference to the rest. I give in italic in the table below the poet's moiety and the other holding which divided tithes with it.

Name	Yearly Value	Description of property
Richard Lane	£80	Tithes of corn & grain in barony of Clopton and village of Shottery.
Richard Lane	£30	Messuages, lands, tenements in Shottery and Drayton.
Thomas Greene	£3	Messuage in Old Stratford.
Wm. Shakespeare	£60	*'The moiety or one half' of* (1) *corn and grain tithes of Old Stratford, Bishopton, and Welcombe, and* (2) *wool, lamb, and privy tithes in the whole parish of Stratford-upon-Avon.*
Lord Carewe of Clopton	£20	Tithes of corn, grain, and hay in Bridgetown (for 19 years). Reversion for remainder of the period of the original lease to R. Lane.
Sir Edward Greville	£2	Reversion of one messuage in Stratford after J. Lupton.
Sir E. Conway	£30	Tithes of corn, grain, and hay in Luddington.
Mary Combe, widow, William Combe & John Combe, "or some or one of them."	£60	For six years to come '*the other moiety or half' of* (1) *corn and grain tithes of Old Stratford, Bishopton, and Welcombe, and* (2) *wool, lamb, and privy tithes in the whole parish of Stratford-upon-Avon.*
	£10	Corn, grain, and hay tithes of Rion Clifford.

Thos. Greene		*Reversionary estate in "the same moiety of all the same tithes of corn and grain and wool and lamb, and small and privy tithes," after Lady Day, 1613.*
John Nashe	20 marks (£13, 6s. 8d.)	Corn, grain, and hay tithes of Drayton.
John Lane	£8	A hereditament in Stratford called Biddle's Barn, lately converted into tenements, and other messuages.
Anthony Nashe	£4	Tenement in Bridge St., Stratford.
Mary Combe, widow, and her son William	£5	Cottages and gardens in Old Stratford; pasture land in Rion Clifford; land in their enclosure called St. Hill.
Daniel Baker	£20	Tithes of Shottery Meadow and Broad Meadow.
John Smith	£8	Tenements, barns, and gardens in Stratford.
Francis Smith, the younger	£12	Two barns and divers tenements in Stratford.
Wm. Walford	£2	Two tenements in Chapel St., Stratford.
Wm. Court	£3	Two tenements in the same.
John Brown	£4	One messuage in Bridge St., Stratford.
Christopher Smith	£4	One messuage in Henley St., Stratford.
Thos. Jakeman	£10	One yard land (*ca.* 30 acres) in Shottery.
R. Kempson of Binton	£8	One yard land and a half in Binton.
Stephen Burman	£15	One yard land and a half in Shottery.
Thos. Burman	£5	One-half a yard land in Shottery
Wm. and Thos. Burman, as executors for the late Stephen Burman	£3	Tenement in Church St., Stratford
Thos. Horneby	£3, 10s.	His dwelling house in Stratford.
A list of 17 other names, each of whose holdings is estimated at £3 yearly	£ 51	Messuages, shops, barns, and gardens, occupied by poor people, of whom three are widows.

It appears from this that forty-two persons had rights under the original ninety-two year lease, and that the total annual income was estimated at £473, 16s. 8d. If this estimate was correct, Shakespeare's moiety or half-interest in the corn and grain tithes of three villages and certain other tithes for the entire parish amounted to just over an eighth of the total value of the property covered by the lease. It is clear also that the half-interest corresponding to Shakespeare's was for the time being in the hands of the wealthy Combe family,[6] with whom the poet had such extensive business relations; but that it would pass on Lady Day, 1613, to Shakespeare's cousin, Thomas Greene.

This explains why Greene, whose immediate holding under the lease was only a single house worth £3 a year, is joined with the large owners, Richard Lane and Shakespeare, in the petition. In a few years he would come into a property as large as the poet's, but this was imperilled by the carelessness or arrogance of the Combes, who, it is implied, were among the defaulters.

The date of this petition, addressed to Thomas Lord Ellesmere, Lord Chancellor of England, is not stated in the document itself and has been variously conjectured by modern commentators. Halliwell-Phillipps prints it (*Outlines,* 7th ed., II, 25) under the unexplained heading: "A Draft of a Bill of Complaint respecting the tithes, Shakespeare being one of the plaintiffs, 1612." But elsewhere in the same book (I, 227) he says of it: "The exact period is unknown, but it was in the same year, 1609, or not very long afterwards." Sir Sidney Lee states, without qualification: "In 1610 Shakespeare and his friends presented a bill of complaint to Lord-Chancellor Ellesmere" (*Life,* 1922, p. 321). Mrs. Stopes, on the other hand, says, likewise without discussion: "At last [Lane, Greene, and Shakespeare] made a complaint before the Lord Chancellor against the defaulting shareholders in 1612." (*Shakespeare's Industry,* 1916, p. 264).

I think the date can be fixed from internal evidence as sometime between January and March, 1609. The paper states that

[6] By Sir John Huband's will one moiety (that which Shakespeare bought) was bequeathed to Ralph Huband, his brother. The other moiety was left in trust to the Stratford bailiff and burgesses, who were to pay off his debts and lagacies from the income. The Combes apparently had acquired it from the Stratford authorities.

the Combe moiety of the tithes is in possession of Mary Combe, widow, William Combe, and John Combe, "or some or one of them"; and that other property belongs to Mary Combe, widow, and her son William. Now Mary Combe was the widow of Thomas Combe, whom an earlier manuscript note by Thomas Greene indicates as the owner of the tithe moiety,[7] and who was buried in Stratford, January 11, 1609. The document cannot have been drawn up earlier than that date; but it states that the three surviving Combes have an estate in the moiety "for the term of six years or thereabouts yet to come" and that Thomas Greene has "an estate of and in the reversion of the same moiety" after Lady Day (March 25) "which shall be in the year of our Lord God 1613." It is hard to get a term of six years, or even "thereabouts," between these limits; but it can be done if we remember that Lady Day, 1613, would have been the first day of the year by the "annunciation" calendar then in vogue, and that the period of two months and a half following the burial of Thomas Combe would have been counted as belonging to the year 1608. I suppose that the complaint was drawn up at some time before March 25, 1609, and that in roughly indicating the period the Combe interest in the tithes had still to run the complainants counted all the years from 1608 till 1613 inclusive.

It may have been the death of Thomas Combe which specifically suggested to Shakespeare and Greene the importance of at once securing a readjustment of the unfavorable position in which both were placed by the Combe neglect of contractual obligation. Should Barker be driven to legal action by his inability to collect rent from the Combes, it might technically prejudice all the body of leaseholders, but what it would most obviously affect would be Greene's reversionary rights in the Combe estate and Shakespeare's interest in the tithes which he divided with the Combes. Richard Lane, as much the largest of all the proprietors, would naturally be invited to head the petition, though Lane's particular grievance

[7] Halliwell-Phillipps (*Outlines*, II, 348) notes that in the Stratford rent-roll crediting Sir John Huband's executors with ownership of the two tithe moieties an insertion is made 'in Thomas Greene's later handwriting —"Mr. Thomas Combes and Mr. William Shakespeare."' This must have been written, of course, between Shakespeare's purchase of the tithe moiety (July, 1605), and Thomas Combe's death.

doubtless lay, not with the Combes, but with Lord Carewe, a specially impudent defaulter, who held a nineteen-year estate in some tithes that were afterwards to revert to Lane.[8]

That the complaint was drafted soon after Thomas Combe's death is also suggested by the uncertainty of the complainants concerning the present ownership of Thomas's tithe-rights, as between Mary, his widow, William, his son, and John, his brother. It is evident that Shakespeare and his associates gained their point. No formal decision of the case has been found, but there is an answer by William Combe[9] in a very conciliatory spirit. William admits that he is the owner of the tithe moiety and that he pays (*i. e.*, recognizes obligation to pay) £5 yearly towards Barker's rent. He furthermore offers to pay, on account of his other holdings, 6s. 8d. more, which he thinks the complainants are willing to accept, and he joins with the complainants in urging a rateable adjustment of dues among all the beneficiaries of the original lease.

TUCKER BROOKE.

Yale University.

NOTES ON THOMAS NASHE'S WORKS.

The following notes are made with reference to *The Works of Thomas Nashe,* edited by Ronald B. McKerrow, London, 1904-1910.

The Anatomie of Absurditie

Vol. i, p. 15. "Plato . . gaue thanks to Nature especiallie for three things, whereof the first and cheefest was, that shee had made him a man and not a woman." Cp. Lactantius, *Divin. Inst.* iii, 19, 10: "Non dissimile Platonis illud est, quod aiebat se gratias agere naturae: primum quod homo natus esset potius quam mutum animal, deinde quod mas potius quam femina, quod Graecus quam barbarus, postremo quod Atheniensis et quod temporibus Socratis." This passage is quoted by Françoys de Billon in *Le Fort Inex-*

[8] The complaint is endorsed: 'Lane, Greene et Shakspeare contra W. Combe et alios respondentes.'

[9] This is the same William Combe who later made trouble by an arrogant attempt to enclose common lands at Welcombe.

pugnable de l'Honneur du Sexe Feminin, Paris, 1555, p. 10: "Lequel Plato, ainsi que refere Lactance, rendoit graces a Dieu de quatre choses, entre autres. La premiere, pourautant qu'il étoit nay Homme, & non brute Beste. La Seconde, pource qu'il étoit Grec, non Barbare. La tierce a l'occasion de ce que sa nayssance auoit été en Athenes, & du temps de Socrates. Et la quatrieme pource que Dieu l'auoit plus tost créé Masle, que Femelle."

i, 16. "The Massagets told Pompey they lay with their wiues but once a weeke, because they wold not heare their scoldings in the day, nor their pulings in the night." Add the story of the Massagetae, quoted from 'the annales Pompeyens,' in Lord Berner's *Golden Boke of Marcus Aurelius* (1535), cap. xix: "on the holy dayes they dyd eate to gyther, and ones in the weke they lay togyther. Whan great Pompeye had questioned the cause of their lyuynge in that maner, for that he neuer sawe nor knewe a more extreme thynge in all the worlde. One of them answered: Pompey behold, the goddis haue gyuen vs but a short lyfe, for none of vs may lyue aboue lx. yere at the moste, and those yeres we trauayle to lyue in peace. And in hauyng our wyues with vs styll in companye, we shulde lyue euer dyenge: for we shulde passe the nyghtes in herynge their complayntes: and the dayes in suffryng their brawlynges and chydinges." Also, North's *Diall of Princes,* ii, 15.

i, 19. "The Poets inuent that Atlas vpholds the Heauens with his shoulders, because by an excellent imagination he found out the course of the stars." Cp. E. K.'s note on *The Shepheardes Calender,* v, 142, "Atlas king of the same countrye . . . who (as the Grekes say) did first fynd out the hidden courses of the starres, by an excellent imagination. Wherefore the poetes feigned, that he susteyned the firmament on hys shoulders"; Servius, on *Aen.* i, 741, "hic quod annum in tempora diviserit et primus stellarum cursus . . . descripserit, caelum dictus est sustinere."

i, 23 (and ii. 138). The story of Thales falling into a well, when observing the stars, is at least as old as Plato, *Theaetetus,* 174 A.

i, 36. "Valentinianus the Emperour, who was a professed enemie to all excellent Artes, or Licinius, who likewise termed learning the plague and poison of the weale publique." Cp. Ravisius Textor's *Officina,* i, 98 (Venice ed., 1567), "Licinius im-

perator fuit litteris adeo infestus, ut virus ac pestem publicam eas appellaret . . . Valentinianus quoque imperator, Gratiani filius, magno litterarum odio conflagravit."

i, 38. "Porus that peerelesse Indian Prince contented himselfe with breade and water as his accustomed cheere. . . . Constantius kept himselfe so hungerly, that many times hee woulde craue a crust of breade of a poore woman to expell hunger. The Priests of Aegipt abstained from flesh and wine." Cp. the list of 'Sobrii et Temperantes' in Textor's *Officina,* ii, 190-91, "Porus rex Indorum aqua et pane vivebat contentus . . . Aegyptiorum sacerdotes . . . carnibus et vino abstinebant. . . . (Constantius imperator) superatus a Persis frusto panis a quadam vetula porrecto inediam repulit."

i, 39. "The Persians were satisfied with breade, salt, and water." Add Alexander ab Alexandro, *Genial. Dies,* iii, 11, "Persarum quoque milites adeo abstemii traduntur, ut pane et aqua saepius victitarint."

i, 41. "Eating a whole sheepe with Phago, or an Oxe with Milo." Add Textor's *Officina,* ii, 188, "Phago fuit quispiam adeo gulosus, ut adhibitus mensae Aureliani aprum integrum, centum panes, vervecem et porcellum uno die comederit, biberitque orcam vini. Auctor Flavius Vopiscus." Milo is mentioned in the same chapter: "in Olympia quadrimum solus absumpsit taurum."

Pasquill of England to Martin Iunior

i, 64. "Withereth as the Grasse vppon the house toppe before the Mower be able to fill his hande with it." *Psalm* 129, 6, "The grass upon the housetops, which withereth afore it groweth up: Wherewith the mower filleth not his hand."

The First Part of Pasquils Apologie

i, 127. "I reioyce to trace after him aloofe, with reuerence and honour vnto his steppes." Cp. Spenser, *S. C.* Epil. 11, "But followe them farre off, and their high steppes adore"; Statius, *Theb.* xii, 817, 'sed longe sequere et vestigia semper adora."

Supplication to the Diuell

i, 175. "Vlisses . . . by himselfe hee would neuer aduenture

but in the night." Cp. Ovid, *Met.* xiii, 14, "sua narret Ulixes, Quae sine teste gerit, quorum nox conscia sola est"; *ib.* 100, "Luce nihil gestum, nihil est Diomede remoto."

i. 184. "As a Wolfe, beeing about to deuoure a horse, doth balist his belly with earth, that hee may hang the heauier vppon him." Albertus Magnus, *De Animalibus,* xxii, 114, "Famelici terra aliquando satiantur quae glis vocatur. Hac etiam superimplentur cum equum vel bovem vel aliud forte animal prosternere quaerunt."

Foure Letters Confuted

i, 309. "Sanctum et venerabile vetus omne poema." A blend of Ovid, *Tr.* i, 18, 15, "illud amicitiae sanctum et venerabile nomen," and Horace, *Ep.* ii, 1, 54, "adeo sanctum est vetus omne poema."

i, 322. "As light as the poet Accius, who was so lowe and so slender that hee was faine to put lead into his shooes for feare the winde shoulde blowe him into another Countrie." Probably, as Dr. McKerrow says, an error for Philetas of Cos. But Accius, too, was a very little man: Pliny, *N. H.* xxxiv, 5, 19, "notatum ab auctoribus et L. Accium poetam in Camenarum aede maxima forma statuam sibi posuisse, cum brevis admodum fuisset." Cp. the Epistle Dedicatory to Lyly's *Euphues and his England,* "as Accius (couered) his shortnesse, who being a lyttle Poet, framed for himselfe a great picture."

Christs Teares ouer Ierusalem

ii, 36. "Consuetudo est altera natura." Cp. Gower's *Confessio Amantis,* vi, 663, "For in Phisique this I finde, Usage is the seconde kinde," where the margin has, "Philosophus. Consuetudo est altera natura." Mr. G. C. Macaulay notes that the Latin quotation is taken from the *Secretum Secretorum* (ed. 1520, f. 21).

ii, 50. "Nor shall they, like the ashes of me the true Phoenix, liue againe." Cp. Martial, v, 7, 1 (of Rome rising from her ashes), "Qualiter Assyrios renovant incendia nidos, Una decem quotiens saecula vixit avis."

ii, 87. "As he incited a number of Phylosophers (in times past) to prosecute theyr ambition of glory in writing of glories contemptibleness." Cp. Cicero, *Pro Archia,* xi, 26, "Ipsi illi

philosophi etiam in eis libellis, quos de contemnenda gloria scribunt, nomen suum inscribunt"; also, *T. D.* i, 15, 34, "Quid nostri philosophi? nonne in iis libris ipsis, quos scribunt de contemnenda gloria, sua nomina inscribunt?"

ii, 90. For Xerxes' reflections on death, add Val. Max. ix, 13, "Eadem Xerxen regem pro totius Asiae armata iuventute, quod intra centum annos esset obitura, profundere lacrimas coegisti."

ii, 96. "Like those that in Affrick present theyr children (when they are first borne) before Serpents," etc. Cp. Pliny, *N. H.* vii, 2, 4; Lucan, ix, 899 (cited by Dr. McKerrow in his final volume, v, 376).

ii, 112. "Dooth the Peacocke glory in his foule feete? Dooth he not hang downe the tayle when he lookes on them?" Cp. Tito Vespasiano Strozzi, *Aeolost.* lib. iii, "Laudari volucris cum se Iunonia sensit, Composito insignem ventilat orbe rotam. Ut reliquae vero male respondentia formae Turpia non pulchro cum pede crura videt, Stellantis condit decus admirabile caudae Tristior, et multi plena pudoris abit."

The Vnfortunate Traueller

ii, 252-4. The stories of Cornelius Agrippa, "the greatest coniurer in christendome," perhaps explain the allusion in Lyly, *Campaspe,* Prol. II, "Agrippa his shadowes, who in the moment they were seene, were of any shape one woulde conceiue."

ii, 275. "Frustra pius." From Horace, Od. i, 24, 11.

ii, 285. "No frosts to make . . . the mulberie tree a strange polititian, in blooming late and ripening early." Cp. Pliny, *N. H.* xvi, 25, 102, "serotino quaedam germinatu florent maturantque celeriter, sicut morus, quae novissima urbanarum germinat nec nisi exacto frigore, ob id dicta sapientissima arborum"; Berners' *Golden Boke of Marcus Aurelius,* cap. viii, "Molberies, that in suche tyme produceth their beryes, whiche is their fruyte, that they feare not the frostes of Maye, as the vynes doo, nor the mystes of Octobre, as the peches and quinces do"; the Epistle Dedicatory to Lyly's *Euphues and his England,* "not daring to bud till the colde were past like the Mulbery."

ii, 297. "The eare of a merchant to heare all and say nothing." Cp. Lyly, *Woman in the Moone,* i, 1, 169, "I see that seruants

must haue Marchants ears, To beare the blast and brunt of euery winde." Other exx. in *N. E. D.* There is an Italian proverb "Fare orecchie di mercante" (used of one who pretends not to hear).

Haue with you to Saffron-Walden

iii, 28. "Those in Germanie, which beeing executed are neuer buried." Cp., perhaps, Tacitus, *Germ.* 12, "proditores et transfugas arboribus suspendunt."

iii, 35. "I haue read that the Giant Antaeus Shield askt a whole Elephants hyde to couer it." Pomponius Mela, *Chorogr.* i, 5, 26, "oppidum pervetus et ab Antaeo, ut ferunt, conditum. extat rei signum parma elephantino tergori exsecta ingens et ob magnitudinem nulli nunc usuro habilis, quam locorum accolae ab illo gestatam pro vero habent."

iii, 40. "Tempus edax rerum, quid non consumitis anni?" Apparently a blend of Ovid, *M.* xv, 234, "Tempus edax rerum," and Martial, ix, 49, 9, "quid non consumitis anni?"

iii, 58. "As Agathocles, comming from a durt-kneading Potter to be a King, would (in memorie of that his first vocation) be serued euer after as well in earthen dishes as sumptuous royal plate." Add Ausonius, *Epigr.* viii, 'Fama est fictilibus cenasse Agathoclea regem," etc. In Schenkel's edition of Ausonius it is noted that this epigram is quoted by Caecilius Balbus, lib. iiii *De Nug. Philosophor.*, and by Ioann. Sarisb., *Pol.* v, 17. It is referred to also by Faustus Andrelinus, *Ecl.* x, 109-15.

iii, 61. "Neuer were Empedocles deuils so tost from the aire into the sea, and from the sea to the earth, and from the earth to the aire again exhaled by the Sun, or driven vp by winds and tempests." Perhaps a confused allusion to a rather confusing passage of Lucretius (i, 782) which discusses the doctrine of 'the four elements' held by Empedocles and others: that fire changes into air, air into water, water into earth, etc., and that these change about incessantly, passing from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven. Cp. Milton, *Par. Reg.* ii, 122, "Demonian Spirits . . . Powers of Fire, Air, Water, and Earth beneath." Also, Ovid, *Met.* xv, 245; and Spenser's second canto *Of Mutabilitie,* st. 25.

iii, 63. "His feete turned backward, like certaine people of the Tartars, that neuertheles are reasonable swift." Pliny, *N.*

H. vii, 2, 11, "super alios autem Anthropophagos Scythas in quadam convalle magna Imavi montis regio est quae vocatur Abarimon, in qua silvestres vivunt homines aversis post crura plantis, eximiae velocitatis."

iii, 64. "O acumen Carneadum (*Carneadium?*)." Cp. Cicero's expression "Carneadia vis," *De Orat.* iii, 19, 71, or "Carneadia divisio," *Fin.* v, 6, 16.

iii, 71. "Some priuy benefactors or patrons that holde him vp by the chin." Cp. Petronius, 43, "quod illius mentum sustulit."

iii, 83. "Vnder the inuersed denomination or anagram of this Word September (as some of our late Deuines and auncient Hebrue Rabbines would enforce vpon vs) is included the certaine time of the Worlds first Creation." Cp. the Generall Argument of the *Shepheardes Calender,* "Notwithstanding that the Aegiptians beginne theyr yeare at September, for that according to the opinion of the best Rabbins, and very purpose of the scripture selfe, God made the worlde in that Moneth, that is called of them Tisri." Apparently Nashe means that some people regarded the Hebrew name for September, *Tishrê,* as an anagram of the word *Reshith,* 'beginning.' See *Genesis,* i, 1.

[Professor Louis Ginzberg, of the Jewish Theological Seminary, New York City, tells me that the anagram *Tishrê-Reshith* is noted by various Rabbinical commentators on *Genesis,* i, 1; e. g., by R. Bahya ben Asher, first ed., Pesaro, 1507; by R. Isaac ben Judah ha-Levi (13th century), *Paaneah Raza,* Prague ed., 1607; in *Hadar Zekenim,* by the Tosafists (12th and 13th centuries), Leghorn ed., 1840.]

iii, 84. "That he which is born under Aries shall neuer goe in a thrid bare cloake." Cp. Petronius, *Sat.* 39, "quisquis nascitur illo signo, multa pecora habet, multum lanae."

iii, 84. "That he which is borne vnder Libra shall bee a Iudge or Iustice of Peace." Cp. Manilius, *Astron.* iv, 549, "Felix aequato genitus sub pondere Librae. Iudex examen sistet vitaeque necisque."

The Prayse of the Red Herring

iii, 160. "Caput extulit undis." The phrase occurs in the *Panegyricus Messallae,* line 123.

iii, 175. "That ancient wine of Falernum, which would last fourty yeare." Cp. Macrobius, *Sat.* ii, 3, 2, "M. Cicero cum apud

Damasippum cenaret et ille vino mediocri posito diceret, 'bibite Falernum hoc, annorum quadraginta est,' 'bene' inquit 'aetatem fert.'"

Summers Last Will and Testament

iii, 270. "Euerie one, when hee is whole, can giue aduice to them that are sicke." Cp. Terence, *Andria,* 309, "Facile omnes quom valemus recta consilia aegrotis damus."

A Prognostication

iii, 391. "Wicked Ostlers, that steale haie in the night from gentlemens horses, and rub their teth with tallow, that they may eate little when they stand at liuery." Cp. the crafty hostler in Alexander Barclay's fifth *Egloge,* "He solde one bottell of hey a dozen times. And in the Otes could he well drop a candle."

W. P. Mustard.

The Johns Hopkins University.

LE MARIAGE DE CHATEAUBRIAND

De retour d'Amérique Chateaubriand rentrait en France au début de 1792. Il cachait dans son cœur de vingt quatre ans, sous attitude de mélancolie dédaigneuse, toute la fièvre d'ambition du génie et de la jeunesse. Sa situation de fortune était mauvaise. L'émigration avait dispersé sa famille; la suppression des droits féodaux avait réduit à peu près à rien le revenu des propriétés héritées de son père. Il ne voyait donc point comment il pourrait faire figure de gentilhomme à l'armée des Princes qu'il se proposait de rejoindre.

Sa famille décida de l'aider. On se servit d'un moyen assez ordinaire à l'époque, mais qui semble choquer le candide Villemain. On résolut de le marier et de "doter ainsi son dévouement royaliste avec la fortune d'une jeune orpheline du pays," Mademoiselle Céleste de la Vigne Buisson. Cette blonde beauté possédait, outre un visage agréable, de précieuses qualités et, chose importante, quelques centaines de mille francs.

Sur ce mariage, dont les circonstances sont restées fort obscures, Sainte-Beuve, dans son livre sur Chateaubriand, a recueilli "cer-

taines assertions singulières" qu'auraient faites Viennet et M. de Pontgervillem; elles s'accordent mal avec le récit des *Mémoires d'Outre Tombe*. M. Biré ne croit pas donner grande créance à la version de Sainte-Beuve, mais par contre ne voit aucune raison de douter de l'exactitude et de la sincérité de Chateaubriand.

La lettre qui suit présente des faits avec une telle précision qu'il est vraiment difficile de les croire inventés. Cette lettre fait partie d'une collection d'autographes de la bibliothèque d'Amiens. Elle est adressée à M. Charles Louandre. Elle est écrite par M. Marteville, imprimeur et libraire à Rennes. Ce Marteville est l'auteur d'une "Histoire de Rennes" qui reçut une mention à l'un des concours de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Nous avouerons que la valeur du témoignage est assez médiocre. En effet, Chateaubriand s'est marié en 1792; la lettre datée de 1851 a été écrite un demi siècle après les faits qu'elle relate. En outre, l'auteur du récit, loin d'être témoin oculaire, se fait l'écho des rumeurs plutôt malveillantes qui circulaient en Bretagne sur les circonstances de cet événement déjà lointain de la vie intime de Chateaubriand. La mort de Chateaubriand, la publication récente des *Mémoires d'Outre Tombe* avaient dû réveiller des souvenirs endormis et donnaient alors à l'anecdote un regain d'actualité.

Etudions donc les deux versions.

Dans la sienne Chateaubriand, en poétisant sa fiancée, s'efforce de relever l'aventure et l'expédient assez vulgaires d'un mariage d'argent; de plus, il nous laisse entendre qu'il n'a fait que se prêter distraitement à des arrangements réglés par sa famille:

> Mes sœurs se mirent en tête de me faire épouser Mademoiselle de Lavigne, qui s'était fort attachée à Lucile. L'affaire fut conduite à mon insu. A peine avais-je aperçu trois ou quatre fois Mademoiselle de Lavigne; je la reconnaissais de loin, sur le Sillon, à sa pelisse rose, sa robe blanche et sa chevelure blonde enflée du vent, lorsque, sur la grève, je me livrais aux caresses de ma vieille maîtresse, la Mer. Je ne me sentais aucune qualité du mari. Toutes mes illusions étaient vivantes, rien n'était épuisé en moi; l'énergie même de mon existence avait doublé par mes courses lointaines. J'étais tourmenté de la muse. Lucile aimait Mademoiselle de La Vigne et voyait, dans ce mariage, l'indépendance de ma fortune. "Faites donc, dis-je. Chez moi l'homme public est inébranlable, l'homme privé est à la merci de quiconque se veut emparer de lui, et, pour éviter une tracasserie d'une heure je me

rendrais esclave pendant un siècle." Le consentement de l'aieul, de l'oncle paternel, et des principaux parents fut facilement obtenu; restait à conquérir un oncle maternel, Monsieur de Vauvert, grand démocrate; or il s'opposa au mariage de sa nièce avec un aristocrate comme moi, qui ne l'étais pas du tout. On crut pouvoir passer outre, mais sa pieuse mère exigea que le mariage religieux fût fait par un prêtre non assermenté, ce qui ne pouvait avoir lieu qu'en secret. Monsieur de Vauvert le sut et lança contre nous la magistrature, sous prétexte de rapt, de violation de la loi, et arguant de la prétendue enfance dans laquelle le grand père, M. de La Vigne, était tombé, Mademoiselle de La Vigne, devenue Madame de Chateaubriand, sans que j'eusse eu de communication avec elle, fut enlevée au nom de la justice, et mise à Saint Malo, au couvent de la Victoire, en attendant l'arrêt des tribunaux. Il n'y avait ni rapt, ni violation de la loi, ni aventure, ni amour dans tout cela; ce mariage n'avait que le mauvais côté du roman: la vérité. La cause fut plaidée, et le tribunal jugea l'union valide au civil. Les parents des deux familles étant d'accord; M. de Vaubert se désista de la poursuite. Le curé constitutionnel, largement payé, ne réclama plus contre la première bénédiction nuptiale, et Madame de Chateaubriand sortit du couvent où Lucile s'était enfermée avec elle.

Telle est la version suivant les *Mémoires d'Outre Tombe.* Il semble que l'adroite négligence de ces explications dissimule quelque embarras. Après avoir peint un portrait des plus élogieux de Mme de Chateaubriand louant ses vertus et ses mérites Chateaubriand termine par un retour sur lui-même et par son aveu de ce mariage sans amour. Voyons maintenant la version suivant la lettre Marteville.

Rennes, le 20 Octobre 1851.

Mon cher M. Louandre,

J'ai été battu à l'Académie qui m'a généreusement octroyé une mention honorable; mais j'ai été relevé par vous, qui m'avez accordé trois pages écrites comme vous savez les écrire, c'est à dire avec le coeur et avec l'esprit. Depuis un mois que je suis revenu de Londres je voulais chaque jour vous remercier et chaque jour m'a apporté une dose d'ennuye telle, que le plaisir et la reconnaissance étaient chez moi ajournés sans terme fixe. Pardonnez-moi et croyez que je serais bien heureux de faire, dans ma petite sphère, quelque chose qui pût vous être agréable.

Je vous avais sans doute rapporté que M. Lenormand m'avait assez mal reçu. Un passage où je donne un faible coup de patte à M. de Chateaubriand avait indisposé contre ma pauvre Histoire de Rennes M. le Rapporteur annuel et perpétuel du concours des

antiquités, exécuteur testamentaire de l'illustre cercueil du Grand Bey.

Et pourtant que de choses nous aurions à dire, nous autres Bretons, sur les *Mémoires d'Outre Tombe* qui ne le cèdent en rien pour la vanterie au Voyage en Orient de M. de Lamartine.

Cet excellent M. de Chateaubriand a bien fait de donner à son livre l'autorité de la tombe. Il y a dans l'ombre d'un sépulcre je ne sais quoi de vénérable qui arrête et désarme la critique. Mais, entre nous, le grand auteur a écrit sur ses premières années des bourdes dignes de M. de Crac.

Voici pour vous égayer une anecdote sur son âge adulte qui ne peut sortir d'une causerie, mais qui a bien son prix.

M. de Chateaubriand n'avait que la cape et l'épée, ce qui, dans le siècle dernier, était presque un vice. Il fallait le marier pour réparer les torts de la fortune; sa soeur Madame de Marigny, se mit en campagne à cet effet et ne tarda pas à jeter les yeux sur une jeune fille de Saint Malo, dont les parents étaient raisonnablement riches. Cette jeune personne fut enveloppée de câlineries et ne tarda pas à aimer beaucoup Madame de Marigny, qui, partant un jour pour la campagne pria le tuteur de lui confier pour quelques jours "cette chère belle."

On partit, et à la terre de Madame de Marigny, on trouva "le petit de Chateaubriand" qui fit une cour assidue mais sans grand succès.

Il fallut en venir au coup d'éclat ou d'état, je ne sais trop lequel.

Un soir, Madame de Marigny mande un ecclésiastique du voisinage, instituteur ou plutôt précepteur des jeunes La . . . . "Mon cher abbé, lui dit-elle, il se passe chez moi un scandale auquel il faut que vous m'aidiez à mettre fin. Mon frère s'est amouraché d'une jeune fille qui m'a été confiée, et la jeune fille s'est laissée prendre à cette passion. Ils passent les jours et les nuits ensemble à se prouver cette belle flamme. C'est une indignité! Enfin, quoique la jeune fille ne soit pas noble, il faut que mon frère répare sa faute en l'épousant." Le bonhomme admira la moralité de la châtelaine. "Que faire, dit-il, je suis tout à vos ordres." "—Suivez-moi, nous allons les surprendre. Le reste sera le fait d'une bonne inspiration." On frappe à la porte de la jeune fille. Silence, puis une voix d'homme demande de l'intérieur: "Que veut-on?" "—C'est moi, mon frère, je sais tout, ouvrez!" Monsieur de Chateaubriand ouvre, dans le simple appareil d'un homme surpris. La jeune fille crie au secours et s'indigne. Il est évident que l'heureux amant n'a d'heureux que l'apparence. Mais Madame de Marigny tonne, menace d'un scandale et le bon prêtre, qui ne remarque pas une porte secrète à demi-ouverte, donne aux jeunes gens la bénédiction nuptiale. On le congédie avec quatre couverts d'argent.

Le frère de la jeune fille, apprenant cette aventure, voulut couper les oreilles à Monsieur de Chateaubriand, qui, prudemment, quitte la France, sans être le moins du monde retenu par sa femme.

Avez-vous lu cela dans les *Mémoires d'Outre Tombe?* Le fait est joli, n'est-ce pas? Mais en tout cas, je n'ai pas besoin de vous dire que c'est une histoire entre nous.

Adieu, cher Monsieur Louandre, recevez de nouveau mes remerciements et me croyez

Tout à vous de coeur,

A. Marteville.

Ce récit assez vivement et agréablement tourné ressemble beaucoup à la version que Sainte-Beuve s'était efforcé d'accréditer, dès 1849, dans le cours qu'il donna à Liège sur Chateaubriand. Toutefois on trouve ici des détails piquants, amusants que Sainte-Beuve ignora.

Il semble que nous assistions à une comédie, préparée de longue main, et qui se termine en farce. Chateaubriand, loin de se laisser faire, comme il dit, prend carrément un rôle actif dans la pièce jouée à son bénéfice.

Quelle créance donnerons-nous à un récit sans autorité et sans preuves, où le parti-pris de la méchancété est évident? Nous pouvons même en découvrir la fausseté puisqu'on a retrouvé l'acte de mariage de Chateaubriand, mariage célébré publiquement dans l'église paroissiale de Saint Malo le 19 mars 1792. Cela ne nous empêche, cependant, pas de supposer que l'union régulière a été précédée de l'étrange comédie que nous venons de relater, et qui, sous peine de scandale, la rendait inévitable.

Nous nous expliquons alors pourquoi la validité de ce mariage à demi forcé a été contesté par la famille de la jeune fille. L'anecdote n'est sans doute pas fausse de tout point; il a dû se passer quelque chose que Chateaubriand ne nous dit pas, et peut-être devons nous chercher la vérité à mi-chemin du récit arrangé des *Mémoires d'Outre Tombe* et des propos médisants recueillis par Marteville et par Sainte-Beuve.

ROBERT FOURÉ.

Ohio State University.

ALLUSIONS TO THE CONTEMPORARY THEATER OF 1616 BY FRANÇOIS ROSSET

I.

It is generally accepted that Marie Venier, dite Laporte, was the first professional female actress, or at least one of the very first, to appear on the stage in Paris. All that is known of her up to the present time is based upon a brief reference in the *Mémoires* of the Abbé de Marolles who relates that, in 1616, he was taken to the theater at the time when: "cette fameuse comédienne appelée Laporte montait encore sur le théâtre et qu'elle se faisoit admirer de tout le monde avec Valleran, et que Perrine et Gautier étoient des originaux qu'on n'a jamais su imiter." Rigal,[1] on the basis of this collocation of names is inclined to assume that her "fame" rested upon her talents as a farceuse. Léopold Lacour,[2] on the other hand, sees in this passage the two pairs of actors contrasted. And this contrast, he thinks, justifies the conclusion that, while Laporte may have played occasionally or even frequently in the farce, she was, nevertheless, best known as a tragédienne.

M. Lacour's contention receives considerable support from a brief passage in one of Rosset's: *Histoires des Amans Volages de ce Temps* (1616). The first of these stories concerns a lover, Cloridan, who learns that his mistress is receiving the attentions of a rival and word comes to him that she has granted this rival a rendez-vous at a certain church. He induces the officiating clergyman to allow him to take part in the service disguised in clerical robes. Thanks to this disguise, he is enabled to "listen in" at this interview and hear his mistress reject the advances of his rival in the most satisfactory fashion. Rosset tries to suggest Cloridan's delight at what he hears in the following sentence: "Je n'estime pas," says Rosset, speaking in his own name, "Je n'estime pas que la femme de la Porte ayt jamais proferé sur un Theatre des paroles plus agreables aux spectateurs, que furent à l'ame de Cloridan celles que je viens d'escrire" (p. 67). The context and the implication of the statement would seem to make it perfectly clear that Rosset considered this pioneer actress as

[1] *Le Théâtre avant la Période classique*, Paris, 1901, p. 172.

[2] *Les premières Actrices françaises*. Paris, 1921, pp. 16 ff.

an *artiste* rather than a *farceuse* and that he assumed that his readers would have the same point of view.

II.

This same year 1616 Rosset published another collection of stories, entitled *Les Histoires Tragiques.* The thirteenth relates the "history," "De l'abominable peché que commit un chevalier de Malte, assisté d'un moine et de la punition qui s'ensuit." (p. 362 ff.). A Polish nobleman while travelling in Italy falls in love with a beautiful Florentine lady, Virginie. He is forced to leave her for a time and continue his travels. On his way to Rome, he falls in with Flaminio (le chevalier de Malte), who had known him at court and conceived a criminal passion for him. Flaminio gains the confidence of the traveller, lures him to a monastery, situated some distance from Rome, and, with the aid of a monk, satisfies his lust. The victim manages to escape, returns to Rome, and reveals the crime to the pope, who has Flaminio and his accomplice punished in exemplary fashion. The nobleman, overcome with shame, withdraws from all intercourse with men. His lady pines away and dies of a broken heart. In the introductory paragraph Rosset declares: Voicy une Histoire non moings veritable qu'horrible et execrable. *Elle se presente sur le Theatre* (p. 363). I can find no trace of any play which would seem to correspond to the story which Rosset relates. The allusion is significant however when taken in connection with a statement made farther on in the same volume. In the introductory paragraph of the nineteenth story (p. 527 ff.), "De la cruauté d'une femme exercée sur son mary: de sa fin malheureuse, et de celle de son Amoureux," Rosset indulges in some comments upon the fatal effects of jealousy. He goes on to say: "Et de là sortent puis apres les deffiances, et les cruelles resolutions *dont les effects sanglants remplissent les Theatres de meurtre et d'infamie.*" [8]

Now in a *Description de Paris* by Thomas Platter of Bâle, published, it seems, in 1599, we read: "Il (Valleran) joue tous les jours après le repas, une comédie en vers et débite ensuite une

[8] Rosset asserts repeatedly that all his *Histoires* are *véritables* and in fact one of them is a reproduction, in his fashion, of what one reads in the correspondence of Malherbe.

farce ***sur ce qui peut être arrivé de drôle à Paris,*** soit en fait d'amourettes ou d'autres anecdotes du même genre." [4] Would the declarations of Rosset justify the assumption that, just as it was the custom to give farces "sur ce qui peut être arrivé de drôle à Paris," there also prevailed the custom of giving, histoires à personnages (Rigal), "sur ce qui pent être arrivé de tragique à Paris?" If one is disposed to grant some plausibility to this hypothesis, one would have another means of accounting for the astonishing fecundity of Alexandre Hardy. A considerable number of the six or seven hundred theatrical productions of which he speaks might well have been adaptations of these tragic contemporary happenings, which, according to Rosset, were prevalent upon the stage during the early years of the seventeenth century.[5]

COLBERT SEARLES.

University of Minnesota.

THE ORIGINAL INSPIRATION OF *LE PROCURATEUR DE JUDÉE*

Professor Henning, in his excellent edition of *Representative Stories of Anatole France,* (Heath, 1924), makes no mention of the work which I believe to have given the first inspiration for *Le Procurateur de Judée.* I refer to Renan's *Origines du Christianisme,* especially Vol. II. In the story Pilate recalls his first meeting with Lamia,[1] saying: "C'était à Césarée, où tu venais traîner les ennuis de l'exil . . . Tu me suivis dans cette triste Jérusalem, où les Juifs m'abreuvèrent d'amertume et de dégoût." Possibly this may have been suggested by Renan's remark: "Césarée était de beaucoup le meilleur port de toute la Palestine et elle tendait de jour en jour à en devenir la capitale. Fatigués

[4] Cited by Léopold Lacour, *op. cit.* without page reference, p. 18.

[5] Rigal has shown that Hardy drew upon one of the *Histoires des Amans volages de ce tems* for the plot of his Tragi-comédie de sujet moderne, *Dorise,* une pièce d'actualité. Alexander Hardy, Paris, 1899, p. 481 f.

[1] The scene is at Baia. Renan, *Les Apôtres,* p. 195, mentions a villa of Lamia's near Pouzzoles. Both places are near Naples.

du séjour de Jérusalem, les procurateurs de Judée allaient bientôt y faire leur résidence habituelle. Elle était surtout peuplée de païens." (*Les Apôtres,* p. 161, 24e édit.). Lamia inquires about the Samarian revolt which Pilate was on the point of suppressing when the friends separated. Pilate replies: "Un homme de la plèbe, puissant par la parole, comme il s'en trouve beaucoup en Syrie, persuada aux Samaritains de s'assembler en armes sur le mont Gazim, qui passe en ce pays pour un lieu saint, et il promit de découvrir à leurs yeux les vases sacrés qu'un héros éponyme, ou plutôt un dieu indigète, nommé Moïse, y avait cachés." Renan refers to the same incident: "L'an 36 . . . un fanatique avait excité parmi les Samaritains une émotion assez sérieuse, en prêchant la nécessité d'un retour au mosaïsme primitif, dont il prétendait avoir retrouvé les ustensiles sacrés." [2] (p. 152). More interesting is the comparison of the disgrace of Pilate as told by Renan and by Anatole France. I shall cite only a portion of the former. A propos of the death of Stephen, Renan remarks that the laws of *Deuteronomy* were observed to the letter, but

[2] Cf. also pp. 263-264: "Quelques années auparavant (before A. D. 44) toute la Samarie s'était émue à la voix d'un illuminé, qui prétendait avoir eu la révélation de l'endroit du Garizim où Moïse avait caché les instruments sacrés du culte. Pilate avait comprimé ce mouvement avec une grande rigueur." Anatole France is universally recognized as the spiritual child of Renan. Specific instances of borrowing have been less frequently indicated. M. Gregh, *Revue Bleue,* 21 février 1901, notes the influence on him of Renan's *Dialogues;* M. Potez, *Mercure de France,* 1 mars 1910, gives Renan's *Quinze Jours en Sicile* (in *Revue des Deux Mondes,* 15 novembre 1875) as the source of Sylvestre Bonnard's trip to Sicily. Both these references are given in Michaut's *Anatole France.* (See p. 149 and pp. 158-159). In *Thaïs* Michaut notes that "Zénothémis, Dorion et Nicias lancent contre le Iahvé 'borné' des Juifs des railleries dont Renan leur a donné l'exemple." (See Michaut, *op. cit.,* p. 166 and note 2, where Michaut refers to *Thaïs,* pp. 173, 179, 189, and to *La Vie Littéraire,* II, p. 323 in which France quotes from *L'Histoire du Peuple d'Israël.*) Michaut remarks that the opening phrase of *Komm l'Atrébate* recalls a famous phrase of *La Prière sur l'Acropole* (Michaut, *op. cit.,* p. 179.). That France greatly admired the *Prière* is evidenced by his speech at the inauguration of Renan's statute at Tréguier. (See *Vers les Temps Meilleurs,* II, 52 ff.). Here he imagines Athena as replying to Renan. M. V. Giraud (*Les Maîtres de l'Heure,* II, 286 ff.) suggests that *La Vie de Jeanne d'Arc* was undertaken as a pendant to *La Vie de Jésus* and that it is conceived in somewhat the same spirit.

that the account in *Acts* makes no mention of the civil authorities. He suggests that this may have been due to the relaxation of Roman severity in Judea. "Pilate venait d'être suspendu de ses fonctions, ou était sur le point de l'être. La cause de cette disgrâce fut justement la trop grande fermeté qu'il avait montrée dans son administration. Le fanatisme juif lui avait rendu la vie insupportable. Peut-être était-il fatigué de refuser à ces frénétiques les violences qu'ils lui demandaient . . . Lucius Vitellius . . . était alors légat impérial de Syrie. Il cherchait à gagner les bonnes grâces des populations, et il fit rendre aux Juifs les vêtements pontificaux qui, depuis Hérode le Grand, étaient gardés dans la tour Antonia. Loin de soutenir Pilate dans ses actes de rigueur, il donna raison aux plaintes des indigènes, et renvoya Pilate à Rome pour répondre aux accusations de ses administrés (commencement de l'an 36). Le principal grief de ceux-ci était que le procurateur ne se prêtait pas assez complaisamment à leurs désirs d'intolérance. Vitellius le remplaça provisoirement par son ami Marcellus, qui fut sans doute plus attentif à ne pas mécontenter les Juifs, et par conséquent plus facile à leur accorder des meurtres religieux. La mort de Tibère (16 mars de l'an 37) ne fit qu'encourager Vitellius dans cette politique. . . . Quand Pilate arriva à Rome, il trouva le nouveau règne déjà commencé. Il est probable que Caligula lui donna tort, puisqu'il confia le gouvernement de Jérusalem à un nouveau fonctionnaire." (p. 141-143).

It will be noted that all of Pilate's story of his disgrace as told by Anatole France is outlined here. This is perfectly natural as he undoubtedly consulted Josephus and other sources indicated by Renan, but it seems highly probable that his attention was first called to this subject by the account in *Les Apôtres*.

We may compare with the end of *Le Procurateur de Judée*, Renan's explanation of the few references to Christianity in Greek and Roman writers. "Il n'est pas étonnant que les écrivains grecs et latins se préoccupent peu d'un mouvement qu'ils ne pouvaient comprendre, et qui se passa dans un petit monde fermé pour eux. Le Christianisme se perd à leurs yeux sur le fond obscur du judaïsme; c'était une querelle de famille au sein d'une nation abjecte: à quoi bon s'en occuper?" (p. 162).

BENJAMIN M. WOODBRIDGE.

Reed College.

MARTIN PARKER'S *PHILOMELA*

Having won a name as a composer of ballads, Martin Parker, like many another popular writer before and since, essayed a higher flight, into the empyrean of pure poetry. The result of his ambition was *The Nightingale warbling forth her own Disaster, or, the Rape of Philomela . . . London* . . . 1632.[1] The poem was ushered into the world with a ceremony worthy of the occasion. A number of commendatory verses express, with more candor than tact, no small surprise at the author's erudition—"Were I not sure," says one Da. Price, "thou didst this worke compile, I'd not beleev't," and other friends pay an equally sincere and lefthanded tribute. A prose argument tells the story "as the Roman poet Ovid writes." There is a dedication, in which Parker wonders why "none of our temporary Laureats have undertaken" such a fine tragedy before. An address to the judicious reader prays for consideration; if the piece is not liked, "all my Poetry is quite kil'd in the egge."

After this preliminary flourish of trumpets, and Parker's acceptance of compliments on his scholarship, one feels let down rather heavily on finding almost no evidence that the author had ever looked at "the Roman poet Ovid." Apart from moralizing—a field in which he needed no assistance—and a few other trifles, he took his material from the story of Tereus and Progue in *The Petite Pallace of Pettie his Pleasure* (1576).[2] Parker may have gone to Ovid for the death of Pandion, which is not in Pettie, but otherwise does not seem to have used him.[3]

The story does not suffer from abridgment; it runs to seventy-two seven-line stanzas. The beginning is in the common medieval manner, which was a common Elizabethan manner too. The poet, taking a walk, comes to a grove excelling that where Venus

[1] The piece was described by Thomas Corser in *Collectanea Anglo-Poetica*, Part IX, pp. 111 ff.; he says, wrongly, that it is paraphrased from Ovid, *Metam.*, VI. It is discussed by Professor Rollins in *Mod. Phil.*, XVI, 449 ff., in his article "Martin Parker, Ballad-Monger."

[2] *Petite Pallace*, ed. Gollancz, 1908, I, 49 ff.

[3] The versions of both Golding and Sandys were available. I do not find any verbal reminiscences of either in Parker's piece, but one would not expect any, since parts of his matter are obviously original, and almost all the rest is drawn from Pettie.

wooed Adonis, a grove in which birds, especially the nightingale, are singing beautifully. This opening, although conventional, was probably suggested by Patrick Hannay's poem on the same theme, or by Gascoigne's.[4]

For the rest, Parker follows Pettie, who followed Ovid—at a distance. This tale, like all of Pettie's, greatly expands the original in a way that would have made Ovid stare and gasp. It is not necessary to quote the several dozen parallels which show how closely Parker depended upon Pettie; a few random samples will serve.

PARKER	PETTIE
Stanza 8: The fame of Progne's beauty spreads abroad—a fact not in Ovid—and Tereus hears of it.	Do. (pp. 52-53)
Stanzas 14-15: Quoth he, I will as carefull of her be, As heaven I wish should have respect to me. Her will I cherish like my owne deare child.	Tereus . . . promising to be as careful of her well-doing as if she were his own sister or child. (p. 60.)
Stanza 19: When in his ship the Fox had got the Kid. . . Against the lawes of gods and men he did Begin to tempt me to his lawlesse will.	Nay, there was never bloody tiger that did so terribly tear the little lamb. . . For being in ship together, he began filthily to fix his fancy upon her, and casting the fear of God from before his eyes. . . . (p. 60.)
Stanza 31: Sister, saith she, alas, and art thou gone? I'le not be long before I follow thee.	"Then farewell, my Philomela," saith she, "thy death I know is cause of this desolation, and thy death shall soon abridge my days."

[4] Works of Hannay, Hunterian Society, Vol. 31, pp. 13 ff.; Works of Gascoigne (ed. Cunliffe), II, 177 ff. Parker's account of Tereus's subjects waiting on the shore to welcome him may be taken from Hannay, p. 37. The metamorphosis may be based on Gascoigne, p. 198. Gascoigne, like Parker, has much moralizing, but so has every poetaster of the time, and Gascoigne's conduct of the tale differs from Parker's in a number of details.

Deere love, set boundes unto thy griefe, quoth he, Thou shalt in me finde husband, father, sister.	. . . "Ah, sweet wife," saith he, "I beseech you by the love which you bear me, to moderate your martyrdom. . . I will be to you instead of a father and a sister." (pp. 62-63.)

Stanzas 34-35:

A Gentleman by chance that way was brought, He having lost his way i'th dead of night Found out this lodge, afarre off seeing light. Thither he rode, and at the window cal'd. . .	A gentleman riding late in the night had lost his way, and seeing a light in her chamber afar off, drew near to the window and called to Philomela. (pp. 64.)

Stanza 45:

The pretty Infant seeing her to sit So pensiuely (as one depriv'd of joy) He runs to her (according to his wit) And askes the cause of her so sad annoy: Mother (saith he) am I not your best boy? Come kisse me then; and Ile goe call my Dad, To come and play with you, and make you glad.	The pretty elf . . . seeing his mother sit sadly, said unto her: "Mam, how dost, why dost weep?" and took her about the neck and kissed her, saying: "I will go call my dad to come and play with thee." (p. 68.)

Thus while Parker's ambling verses are much inferior to Pettie's dainty, polished euphuism, he follows pretty closely Pettie's amplification of the fable, sometimes adding speeches and moralizings of his own. As Professor Rollins has said, the piece shows the hand of the ballad-monger. As for Parker's scholarship, which so astounds his log-rolling friends, one can only infer that Pettie's book was no longer generally remembered, and that the poet kept his own copy to himself.[5]

J. N. Douglas Bush.

Harvard University.

---

[5] One may recall Anthony à Wood's peevish allusion: "The aforesaid *Petite Palace* I have in my study . . . and for the respect I bear to the

LAWS OF PRONUNCIATION IN EASTERN VIRGINIA

There are in Eastern Virginia two dialectal pronunciations to which little attention has been paid. According to modern dictionaries, *ou* in *about, house,* and *out* is pronounced like the *ou* or *ow* of *crowd, how,* and *loud.*[1] But reasonably careful attention to the pronunciation of these six words by a native of that part of Virginia lying east of the Blue Ridge Mountains, known as Eastern Virginia and embracing the Piedmont and Tidewater sections, will reveal a marked difference between the *ou* sound of the first group (*about, house, out*) and that of the second (*crowd, how, loud*).

The so-called standard pronunciation of diphthongal *ou* is approximately that of *a* as in *father* plus that of *oo* as in *pool,* or possibly that of *oo* as in *foot;* but the dialectal pronunciation heard in Eastern Virginia is approximately that of *u* as in *hut* plus the same sound used in standard pronunciation for the second part of the diphthong. Standard *ou* may be represented by [*au*], and dialectal *ou* by [*ɒu*]. The standard is perhaps more theoretical than actual, for there is room for a number of slightly different sounds ranging between that of *a* as in *father* and that of *u* as in *hut* as the first element of the diphthong; but for convenience and clearness in making the distinction between Eastern Virginia usage and that of the United States as a whole, only the two sounds here called, respectively, standard *ou* and dialectal *ou* will be included in this discussion.

According to their pronunciation of such words as *about, house, out, crowd, how,* and *loud,* American speakers of English may be divided into three classes. Those of the first class, which is by far

name of the author (he having been uncle to my mother Maria la Petite) I will keep it; but 'tis so far now from being excellent or fine, that it is more fit to be read by a schoolboy, or rustical amoretto, than by a gent. of mode or language." (*Athenae Oxon.*, ed. Bliss, I, 553, quoted by Gollancz, pp. xv-xvi.)

[1] In present-day English, the spelling is usually, if not always, *ou* when a voiceless consonant immediately follows in the same syllable (*out*), and is usually *ow* when the sound thus represented is at the end of a syllable (*how*, but note *thou* as an exception); but when a voiced consonant immediately follows the diphthong in the same syllable, the spelling is sometimes *ou* (*loud*) and sometimes *ow* (*crowd*).

the largest, uniformly employ in all these words the sound called standard. Members of the second class, which is the smallest, with equal regularity substitute dialectal *ou* for standard *ou* in the words given. The third and, from the standpoint of typical Eastern Virginia speech, the most interesting class includes those who pronounce *about, house,* and *out* with dialectal *ou,* and *crowd, how,* and *loud* with standard *ou.*

This seeming inconsistency invites study. Since speech is a social custom, and since speakers of a given region are not likely to be unaccountably inconsistent in their pronunciation of a given letter or diphthong, it is well to ask whether some principle can be discovered which members of class three follow. It is strange that this survival of older usage has not earlier yielded its secret; and yet not even an attempt to explain such peculiarities as dialectal *about, house,* and *out* beside standard *crowd, how,* and *loud,* and dialectal *house* beside standard *houses* can be found.[2] Careful and prolonged observation and the application of tests to a number of Eastern Virginians have proved that members of class three unconsciously obey the following law:

In typical Eastern Virginia speech, diphthongal ou is given the dialectal sound represented by [ɒu] *when the diphthong is immediately followed in the same syllable by the sound of a voiceless consonant; but under all other conditions standard ou* [au] *is employed.*

Examples of words in which dialectal *ou* is heard are *about, couch,*[3] *doubt, drouth,*[4] *house, mouth,*[4] *out, pouch,*[3] *south,*[4] *trout.*

Examples of words in which standard *ou* is heard are:

(1) *bough, brow, cow, dower, dowry, drowsy, how, trowel, vow, vowel.*

(2) *abound, account, drown, foul, growl, loud, mountain, proud, prowl, sound.*

[2] The few references to dialectal *ou* that can be found are of some interest. See H. C. Wyld, *History of Modern Colloquial English,* New York, 1920, pp. 230-232; the *New Standard Dictionary,* New York, 1913, p. xxvii; and Sylvester Primer, "The Pronunciation of Fredericksburg, Virginia," in the *PMLA,* v, 198 ff.

[3] *Ch* is a voiceless consonantal digraph.

[4] *Th* is in this word a voiceless consonantal digraph.

Tests indicate that the large majority of Eastern Virginians belong to class three; but there are members of class two on the Virginia Peninsula, notably in James City County, and elsewhere in the state. These regularly sound dialectal *ou* in all the groups of words of which examples are given in the above lists.

The second of the two distinctive sounds in the speech of Eastern Virginians is that of *i* in such words as *bright, like,* and *price.* The standard sound of this diphthong is approximately that of *a* as in *father* plus that of *i* as in *pin;* the dialectal sound is approximately that of *u* as in *hut* plus that of *i* as in *pin.* The standard sound may be indicated phonetically by [*ai*]; the dialectal by [*ɒi*].

Though this pronunciation or one very much like it is mentioned by several writers,[5] no suggestion of the real distinction made by Eastern Virginians in the use of standard and of dialectal *i* has been noted. That distinction may be expressed in the following law:

In typical Eastern Virginia speech, diphthongal i is given the dialectal sound represented by [*ɒi*] *under two conditions:* (1) *when the diphthong is immediately followed in the same syllable by the sound of a voiceless consonant; and* (2) *when the diphthong occurs at the end of a syllable which is immediately followed in the same word by an unaccented syllable beginning with the sound of a voiceless consonant and containing an obscurely pronounced vowel. Under all other conditions standard i is employed.*

Examples of words pronounced with dialectal *i* are:

(1) *advice, appetite, bite, fight, ice, knife, life, site, white, wife.*

(2) *cipher, hyphen, hypodermic, license, niter,*[6] *nitrogen, rifle, stifle, viper, vital.*

Examples of words pronounced with standard *i* are:

(1) *alibi, amplify, fly, high, lie, nigh, pry, sigh, vie, why.*

(2) *bias, buyer, dialect, dialogue, diet, hyacinth, myopia, pliant, violet, Zion.*

[5] See H. C. Wyld, *op. cit.*, p. 224; O. F. Emerson, *The History of the English Language*, New York, 1894, p. 201; Webster's *New International Dictionary*, p. lii; and the *New Standard Dictionary*, p. xxvii.

[6] Such a word as *nitrate*, though *a* is not obscure, is pronounced dialectally, possibly because the presence of *r* before *a* leaves voiceless *t* free to influence *i*.

(3) *advisory, bridle, final, finality, hilarious, idle, ivy, private, spider, tiger.*

(4) *biceps, citation, Hyperion, hypotenuse, Isocrates, licentiate, licentious, nitrogenous, typhoid, vitality.*

(5) *advise, archives, blind, climb, file, hide, kind, lives, time, wives.*

The two peculiarities discussed in these pages are characteristic of Eastern Virginia speech and that of a few other sections of the country. The dialectal sounds are clearly due to the specific phonetic conditions pointed out above.

EDWIN F. SHEWMAKE.

Davidson College.

REVIEWS

The Comparison of Inequality, The Semantics and Syntax of the Comparative Particle in English. By George William Small, Instructor in English in The Johns Hopkins University. Dissertation, 1923, pp. ix, 173.

The question as to the origin and development of the comparison of inequality in the Indo-European languages has never been satisfactorily answered. In his dissertation Dr. Small has presented a most convincing analysis of the development of this phenomenon in English.

Starting out from the viewpoint of Sanskrit the author traces the relationship of this construction in the Indo-European languages (Greek, Latin, Romance, and Germanic). Without this comprehensive viewpoint the author's detailed analysis of the phenomenon in English would have been far less intelligible and his conclusions far less reliable. The author scrupulously avoids the exclusive view of any single language (English) or even of any one group of languages.

Dr. Small has made an exhaustive treatment of his subject and leaves one with the impression that very little of importance can be further said regarding this question in English. On the whole, it seems to me, he has shown good linguistic sense and sound judgment thruout his work. The work is refreshingly original; the

author never accepts the verdict of "accepted authorities" without weighing each bit of evidence on its own merits. He is clear and explicit on all points and shows, I may add, a good deal of common sense, which unfortunately is not always present in our dissertations. There is a certain amount of overlapping and repetition but this is in the circumstances unavoidable because of the fact that the subject is treated from different viewpoints (semantic, syntactical, etc.).

The work is admirably arranged. After the *Introduction* (pp. 1-14) the author discusses (*Chapter I*) "The Indo-European System of Comparison" (pp. 15-46) and "The Latin and Romance Comparative Particles" (pp. 47-69). We are thus furnished with a correct basis for our understanding of the phenomenon in English, which the author then discusses in the next two chapters under the headings: "The Temporal Nature of the English Comparative Particle" (*Chapter II,* pp. 70-100) and "The Adversative Element in the English Comparative Particle" (*Chapter III,* pp. 101-121).

These three chapters are then summed up clearly and concisely in the *Conclusion* (pp. 122-123). In view of the complex nature of the study the *Conclusion* is a most welcome addition in that it offers a very convenient synopsis and consequent clarification of the author's study.

To the study proper are added *Appendix A,* "Parataxis and the Subordinate Clause" (pp. 125-132), and *Appendix B,* "The Shift in Meaning of the Conjunctive Particle" (pp. 133-154). These two chapters deal with important phases of the subject.

Finally, the book is furnished with an exhaustive *Bibliography* and an adequate *Index.*

Before attempting any criticism of Dr. Small's dissertation I feel it necessary to give a brief outline of his argument.

In the *Introduction* the author gives a survey of his views on the origin and nature of this construction. He holds the view (and I believe, rightly) that the comparison of inequality in the I. E. languages did not develop (contrary to many scholars) out of the comparison of equality thru contamination or "blending," altho there may be traces of this contamination in the later stages of the language. The Latin particle *quam* in the comparison of inequality is well established in the oldest Latin literature (p. 4),

a fact which militates against the theory that the use of this particle in comparisons of inequality was due to its use in correlative expressions of equality (cf. *tam . . . quam*). The substitution of *als* for *denn* in Mod. German is secondary and lends no support to the theory of contamination in the origin of the comparative particle in the I. E. languages (p. 6).

Dr. Small believes that the I. E. system of comparison of inequality developed out of a *paratactical* construction with an *adversative* element. Not only the oldest particles of comparison (cf. Skt. *na,* Gk. *καὶ οὐ,* Goth. *þau*) but also the frequent use of the negative in the second element of comparison (cf. Gk. and the Romance languages, *Chap. I*) support this view.

The author's discussion (*Introduction,* p. 9 ff.) of the nature of the comparative degree is most illuminating. The primary function of the comparative is to call up to the mind, for the purpose of contrast, two objects or conditions. Contrary to Hora (*Der Komparativ,* 1907) Dr. Small rightly maintains (p. 11) that the comparative is the most *definite* of the three degrees because it is always being limited in one direction, whereas the positive and superlative are constantly shifting in meaning and are always relative. The comparative does not constitute something like the second link in a chain, something that has a fixed value lying between the positive and superlative. Such a conception is the result of the arbitrary listing of forms by the grammarian for the sake of convenience. The latter point is well taken and illustrates Dr. Small's clear judgment; nothing perhaps has been more conducive to misconceived notions on the nature of language than grammatical categories.

Chapter I

(a) *The Indo-European System of Comparison*

The comparative suffixes probably meant at first merely that one object possessed some quality in a high degree, as opposed to or contrasted with some other object; this distinction was at first spatial and quantitative and finally became merely a generalized intensive (p. 22).

The author holds (p. 30 ff.) that the particle-construction after comparatives did not develop out of the case-construction (ablative, genitive, dative), but was an entirely separate development. The

particle-construction is not dependent fundamentally upon the comparative terminations, but has its origin in the simple idea of setting off one object against another in respect to some quality by means of two simple statements, or clauses, one of which becomes subordinate to the other. The comparative construction with Latin *atque, at,* Greek ὡς, MHG. *und* and English *than, as* furnishes very strong evidence against a possible origin in the ablative case. To be sure, the circumlocution by *prepositions* is clearly a substitute for the case-construction, but the comparative *particles* point definitely to a *paratactical* construction.

The adversative nature of the comparative particle in Germanic is illustrated (p. 38 ff.) by the use of Gothic *þau,* German (Luther) *weder* after comparatives. Germanic *and* (Gk. ἀντί) also represents this adversative force; the copulative meaning is secondary (cf. Gk. καί, Lat. *ac, atque, et,* ON. *ok* and Eng. *and* in sentences expressing or implying a comparison).

Whether the particle-construction is a *substitute* for the case of comparison, or vice-versa, is a problem which cannot be definitely decided, since both constructions occur in the earliest stages of the I. E. languages. It is probable, however, that the most primitive method of comparison was paratactical and that the second clause in certain cases was condensed into the ablative of separation. Furthermore, the particle-construction covers all possible conceptions, whereas the case-construction must necessarily be limited in scope; no simple thought, e. g., like "He is taller than he was" can be expressed by the ablative of comparison (p. 30 ff.).

Dr. Small's argument seems to me thoroly convincing both as regards the origin of the particle-construction as a development separate from that of the case-construction and as to the plausibility of the priority of the former construction over the latter.

(b) *The Comparative Particles in Latin and Romance*

The most significant feature connected with this group of languages in its bearing upon the origin of the comparative construction is the fact that the use of the Latin comparative particle *quam* (p. 47 ff.) goes back to an original paratactical construction with the adverbs *plus, minus, amplius* and *longius;* a construction which persisted in classical Latin in such phrases as *plus quingentos colaphos* (Terence, *Adelphi,* 199). English has taken over

this construction from Latin, retaining the paratactical feature intact; cf. "eight plus two" = "more than eight by two."

The older grammarians considered the *quam* as omitted in such phrases but this can hardly be the case in view of the fact that parataxis is probably older than *quam*. On this point I feel that Dr. Small is quite right. There is nothing to support the view that *quam* is omitted in such phrases any more, e. g., than that the relative is "omitted" in English in such phrases as "I read the book you gave me."

The comparative particles superseded the case-construction in Latin and the Romance languages, just as in the Germanic languages.

The author does not attempt (from lack of evidence) to establish the original meaning of *quam* (p. 68 f.). So far as the evidence goes, no definite meaning was attached to this particle beyond a mere turning of the attention from one object to another. If *quam* had any definite significance in the mind of the speaker, it was possibly the temporal idea, *then,* which may have been felt in Old Latin *quamde.* The latter inference offers an exact parallel to the Germanic particle-construction with *þan, þanna* (a fact to which the author refers in the next chapter, p. 100).

Chapter II

The Temporal Nature of the English Comparative Particle

The comparative relation in English is at once *temporal* and *adversative,* the *temporal* idea being the original from which the *adversative* was developed. The adversative relation, which developed out of the temporal in the English particle, *þonne, then, than,* indicates that the English conception of the comparative relation is in fundamental accord with that of the other I. E. languages.

The author's refutation (p. 96 ff.) of O. Johnsen's attempt (*Ang.* 38, 83 ff.; and 39, 101 ff.) to establish an original local meaning for the OE. particle *þon, þonne* (as based upon the OE. charters) is thoroly convincing. Dr. Small clearly shows here (as elsewhere) his comprehensive view of the question, whereas Johnsen's conclusions are due to the fact that the latter has rested his demonstration on an arbitrary interpretation of a few OE. texts, ignoring the evidence of *general* Germanic.

The comparative particles in the Germanic languages are represented by *þan* (which occurs in all the Germanic languages) and by WGerm. *þanna* (<* *þannai*). Gothic *þan* is not used as a comparative particle, but its adversative as well as temporal meaning identifies it as to form with the WGerm. and ON. comparative particle (ON. *enn*<* *þan*). Gothic alone employs the strictly adversative particle *þau*, from which fact Dr. Small rightly concludes (*Chap. III,* p. 104) that the construction with *þau* after the comparative is peculiar to Gothic and was, therefore, probably not an established idiom in Primitive Germanic. This usage in Gothic seems to me further significant insofar as it may indicate the *artificial* character of the Gothic language as we possess it.

There can hardly be any doubt (as the author points out, p. 85 f.) that ON. *en(n), an,* Swed. *än,* Dan. *end* is derived from Germanic *þan.*

On page 87 the author gives a diagram illustrating the usage of the comparative particles in the Germanic languages.

Chapter III

The Adversative Element in Comparison

The adversative force of the Gothic particle *þan* = 'yet,' 'but,' 'however,' altho never used as a comparative particle, is in accord with the adversative force of the WGerm. comparative particle *þan(na).*

In OS. the adversative nature of the particle *þan* remains prominent and the same is true of OE. *þonne.* In English the many substitutes for *than, then* such as *but, besides,* etc., and in the older period *nymþe, nefne, butan,* etc. clearly indicate the adversative nature of the comparative particle; compare also the use of *nor* (*ne, na*) as a comparative particle in colloquial English ("Better be happy *nor* wise").

This adversative element, along with the temporal element out of which it developed, goes to make up the complex conception in the mind of the speaker of English when he uses the particle after a comparative.

Even tho there is no doubt that a strong adversative element was felt in the comparison of inequality in most of the Indo-European languages, Dr. Small feels it unsafe (p. 120) to attempt to posit a common Indo-European construction. Here again the

author shows his good judgment and scholarly caution; there has been attempted altogether too much reconstruction of our "parent speech," as well as too much generalization without sufficient evidence of a comparative nature.

In *Appendix A*, "Parataxis and the Subordinate Clause," Dr. Small presents a clear outline of the history and nature of this question. The main point in his thesis is that when the original paratactical clause became hypotactical in nature the fundamental meaning of the introductory particle was usually altered and often lost.

It is this latter question which he treats in *Appendix B*, "The Shift in Meaning of the Conjunctive Particle," confining himself to certain English particles, such as *where, whereas, so, while*, etc. The shift in meaning of such particles from some simple, concrete conception to a variety of shades of abstract, notional meaning and the shift in function from demonstrative to relative are evidence in favor of the view that the subordinate clause is a later development of a coördinate, independent clause.

I find very little to criticize in Dr. Small's dissertation either in respect to subject matter or to minor details. To my mind he has proved his main thesis beyond peradventure. The evidence he presents seems to me in each case sufficient to establish the plausibility of his hypothesis. There are a few minor points, however, which I should here like to raise.

In footnote 2 on page 44 the author discusses the question as to the priority of the particle-construction over the case-construction. I wonder if it would not have lent a greater coherence to his argument if the author had introduced this material earlier in his text, *i. e.* on page 30 ff., where this question is first raised.

In this same footnote the author says: ". . . . the former [the particles] are found beside the case-form expressing conceptions that are impossible with the case-form, or with the prepositions."

The phrase "impossible with" here seems to me to lack conciseness. It is a question here of *grammatical expression* which is "impossible." I should rather say: ". . . . expressing conceptions *which* are impossible *to express by means of* either the case-form or the prepositions."

A few other minor points of clarity in expression occur to me. On page 29 in discussing the prepositions after the comparative

Dr. Small says: "As the dative of comparison died out the particle took its place gradually; therefore, the need for prepositions was never felt in Germanic."

The meaning of the latter phrase is, of course, that "the need for prepositions *after the comparative* was never felt in Germanic." As the statement stands, however, it is not qualified; which compels the reader to infer its specific application.

In the last line on page 30—top of page 31 the author says: "For, if the particle-construction be taken merely as a substitute for the ablative (dative, genitive), then we must assume that this ablative practically expanded into the second member of a paratactical construction to produce the particle-construction."

I do not see just exactly what is meant by the word "practically" in the phrase "practically expanded."

On page 75 (bottom)—page 76 in his translation of *Beo.* 1836 I do not understand why the author shifts his pronoun of address from *thee* to *you* (*your*) since both these pronouns refer to the same person and are represented in the original by *þe.*

In discussing the shift in meaning of the OE. temporal adverb *þa,* when used as a subordinate conjunction (p. 142 ff.), the author would have contributed to his exposition if he had called attention to the parallel shift of meaning in the German temporal particle *da, i. e.* "there" > "when" > "since."

As to subject matter there is really only one point on which I feel myself in disagreement with Dr. Small.

On page 129 in footnote 1 Dr. Small maintains that the relative clause in Modern English is "still essentially a paratactical construction in which the relative pronoun merely repeats the antecedent." In illustration of this statement he adds: "I saw the book of which you spoke = I saw the book; you spoke of it."

Dr. Small seems to me here to be straining his point somewhat. To be sure, the relative clause and the paratactical clause are identical in sense, but does this congruence in sense render the relative clause "*essentially* paratactical?" The question here is one of grammatical expression. To be sure, the relative pronoun repeats the antecedent, just as any pronoun repeats the noun for which it stands, but to the relative pronoun has become attached a ***subordinate sense*** which was ***not present*** in the ***original paratactical*** construction. I fail to see just exactly what the author

means by the phrase "essentially paratactical." The relative clause in English certainly had its origin in parataxis but that stage has in Mod. English passed over into hypotaxis, wherever the relative pronoun is used. How then is the relative clause in English "essentially paratactical," if introduced by a relative pronoun (which is certainly a subordinating particle)? Origin and present status are two entirely different things.

Wherever the relative pronoun is not used in introducing a relative clause in English, as in the sentence "I read the book you gave me," we may consider the relative clause as expressed paratactically. Even here I do not consider the relative clause as "essentially paratactical" because the speaker feels the clause as subordinate, not as coördinate. To my mind such a clause is *essentially hypotactical* but *expressed paratactically,* because the nature (*i. e.* the meaning) of the clause is subordinate even tho it is not introduced by a subordinate particle.

I may add that the Modern Scandinavian languages, as well as Modern English, preserve intact the original parataxis in relative clauses; cf. Swed. "jag läste den bok du gav mig," "I read the book you gave me."

The book does not contain many misprints. It is to be regretted perhaps that the OE. ligature *æ* is printed as two separate vowels, *ae;* also that the printer has consistently omitted the circle over the vowel *a* in Swedish words, *i. e. a* for *å*.

Aside from the printer's inaccuracy in reproducing the sign of the umlaut in Germanic words, the following misprints are to be noted: *comparsion* for *comparison* (p. 5); *higest* for *highest* (p. 12 bottom); *kein gold is* for *kein gold ist* (p. 16 bottom); *mǣst* for *māest* (p. 23); [*ON.* : *rammari*] *ollum* for *ǫllum* (p. 27); *etablished* for *established* (p. 32); *Dan. i ere bedre* for *I ere bedre* (p. 41); *Ashehoug* for *Aschehoug* (p. 41); *obselete* for *obsolete* and *an apocopate form* for *apocopated form* (footnote 3, p. 41); "Modern Norw. *an, en,* Swed. *aen*" (p. 85) should read "Modern Norw. *enn* (*end*), Swed. *än,* the form *an* is Old Norse, a by-form of *enn;* in the phrase (p. 85) "Kock explained the dropping of the initial þ an as assimilation. . . ." omit the word *an* after þ; *freature* for *feature* (p. 121); *explict* for *explicit* (p. 129).

I note also a lack of consistency in the capitalization of the word *modern* (abbreviated *mod.*) as applied to the various languages

under discussion; cf. "mod. E." (pp. 29, 93 twice), "mod. HG." (p. 29) but "ModE." (p. 7), "Mod. HG. (p. 42) and "Mod. LG." (p. 43). I should suggest the capitalized form (*i. e. Mod.*) in all such cases inasmuch as the word *Modern* here is used in a technical sense referring to a certain period in the history of the language.

Finally I note that the author classifies the Scandinavian group of languages as belonging to East Germanic; cf. his diagram on page 87 and his reference (p. 41) to ON. *en(n)* as the "East Germanic particle."

One may very well ask why he has done this. There is no reason why the Scandinavian languages should not be regarded as a separate group, *i. e.* North Germanic. A glance at the author's diagram shows that in Old Norse the Germanic particle *þan* was used in a comparative function in common with West Germanic and as opposed to the Gothic usage. And in many other respects the Old Norse differed from the Gothic to such an extent that we are no longer justified in grouping these two languages together under the head of East Germanic.

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT.

University of Kansas.

Tieck's Approach to Romanticism. By ALFRED EDWIN LUSSKY. Borna-Leipzig: Universitätsverlag von Robert Noske, 1925. Pp. x, 119.

The purpose of Dr. Lussky in this important doctoral dissertation submitted at the University of Michigan is to study once more the development of Ludwig Tieck as a romanticist, with a view to showing that Haym's interpretation of the problem is inadequate in its exposition of the facts and incorrect in its conclusions. To this end the author wishes to examine "the essential characteristics of Tieck's mind" (page 2) and to show that Tieck's approach to Romanticism was natural, spontaneous and in conformity with the inherent nature of the man, and not affected and forced. He has endeavored to do this by making a painstaking, conscientious examination of "the internal and external influences

up to 1798 which led to Tieck's development as a Romanticist" (page 6).

More concretely stated, Dr. Lussky's object is to refute Haym's elaborate argument of the first sections of the *Romantische Schule,* which posits the fundamental theory 1) that Tieck was converted to Romanticism by his friend Wackenroder, and 2) that this conversion was effected by the three elements of "musikalische Stimmung," "ahndungsvoller Ton" and "fromme Kunstandacht."

The author proceeds to establish his refutation by endeavoring to show that of the two, Tieck's personality and not Wackenroder's was the dominating one; that Tieck had an essentially romantic turn of mind; that Tieck's chief characteristics are his longing for universality and for infinite constructive order, and his love for genuine poetry, all of which represent "the basic strivings of German Romanticism" (page 39). He goes on to say (pp. 39-40): "Being thus essentially a romantic personality, Tieck at the very beginning of his career naturally feels greatly attracted by writers who are romantic and are considered as such by the leading critics and philosophers of the Romantic School in Germany. Among the many romantic literary influences upon Tieck's poetic development, the most important were 1) the writers of the Storm and Stress period, including the early works of Goethe and Schiller, 2) Shakespeare, and 3) the writers of the Romance nations, particularly Cervantes. Besides literary influences, there were also personal friendships which assisted considerably in confirming Tieck in his faith in the world of Romanticism. Such personal influences were afforded by his association with the women of the romantic circle in Berlin. Through them Tieck became acquainted with Friedrich Schlegel and Schleiermacher, and finally with A. W. Schlegel. Hence the culminating point in his personal relationships coincides with that of his development into a romanticist. Both occur in the year 1798. Then when Tieck has developed a firm faith in idealism, he finds a new significance in Wackenroder's ideas on art, interprets them in his own way, and uses them to some extent in his later romantic career."

In order to clench his argument, Lussky then examines four typical early works of Tieck, *William Lovell,* the *Straussfedern, Peter Lebrecht* and the *Volksmärchen,* and finds in each of them unmistakable signs of inchoate Romanticism.

The dissertation is a sober, well-reasoned discussion of a vital problem. It errs, however, in ascribing *too* subordinate a rôle to the influence of Wackenroder, who, although he was of a more passive, retiring nature than Tieck, certainly must be called the more profound thinker, the more pervasive artist and an undeniable inspirational factor in Tieck's life. Furthermore, in refuting Haym at such length, the work is in a sense combating a man of straw. For almost all the recent critics with an independent turn of mind—not alone Pulver and Wüstling, the only ones cited by the author—discredit Haym's exaggerated theory either explicitly or implicitly.

Nadler, for example, in his *Berliner Romantik,* speaks of Tieck's innate "inneres Aufgeschlossensein" (page 72) and continues: "dieses innere Aufgeschlossensein vernahm bei Tieck freilich zunächst nur Spuk und Gespenster, aber er hatte den sechsten Sinn, und es war seine Sache, mit ihm nach den rechten Erscheinungen zu suchen. Jedenfalls steht Tieck gerade mit diesem Zug seines jungen Wesens sowohl innerhalb der mystischen Reihe seiner Heimat wie der Gesamtbewegung des Ostens." There is no mention here of any influence on the part of Wackenroder. Such an influence Nadler finds only in another matter (p. 73): "Erst durch Wackenroder und später, als die Bewegung schon vorgeschritten war, begann das Christentum, zumal der römischen Kirche, auch für Tieck ein Problem zu werden."

Strich also, in *Deutsche Klassik und Romantik,* in describing a type of Romanticism that seeks the infinite void and breaks away from law and restraint, goes much farther than Lussky does for instance in his treatment of *William Lovell.* Strich calls the novel "das reinste Beispiel solcher Romantik" (page 45), implying that when Tieck wrote it he was already a pronounced Romanticist.

Stefansky, too, in *Das Wesen der deutschen Romantik,* although quite correctly considering Tieck under Wackenroder's spiritual influence even after the latter's death (page 159), and although finding the imprint of Wackenroder's friendship even in *William Lovell* (page 161)—a thing that Lussky categorically rejects,—speaks of Tieck "dessen eigengemässe Denkform wir unwandelbar durch sein Leben verfolgen können; sein Lebensgefühl und dessen Ausdruck aber verändert sich merkbar, was freilich seine objekti-

ven Gründe hat" (page 220); in another place Stefansky mentions "das innere geistige Gefüge" (page 221) of Tieck, which, he indicates, remained constant throughout his life.

In view of the fact that these writers would have afforded the author invaluable substantiation of his argument, it is regrettable that he did not include them in his discussion.[1] Nadler's theory in particular would have deserved to be considered at length in conjunction with the proposition that Tieck is essentially of a Romantic turn of mind.

Finally, Lussky fails to give due attention to the important romantic influence of Jakob Boehme, which appears as early as 1792 in *Abdallah*.[2]

The press-work seems very good when one considers that the book, written in English, was set up and printed in Germany. Only one serious misprint has been noticed: on page 4 read 1773, not 1772, as the date of Tieck's birth.

It is the reviewer's hope that Dr. Lussky, so well versed in the mentality and works of Tieck, will continue his researches on that much misunderstood author and, taking into account also the writings of such critics as Nadler and Stefansky (especially the latter), corroborate the conviction long held by the reviewer that even in later life Tieck, although adopting an outwardly realistic manner, remained at bottom what he had always been—a Romanticist.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL.

Indiana University.

Poesía Juglaresca y Juglares. By RAMÓN MENENDÉZ PIDAL. Madrid, Centro de Estudios Históricos, 1924. viii + 488 pages.

Another superb work issues from that Madrid study which has given the world of Hispanists so many masterpieces of penetrating erudition. In this small but solid brown volume Sr. Menéndez

[1] Strich (1922) and Stefansky (1923) are not mentioned at all. Nadler's work is quoted in the notes, but only in passing and in another connection.

[2] Cf. Edgar Ederheimer, *Jakob Boehme und die Romantiker*, 1. und 2. Teil, Heidelberg, 1904, page 26.

Pidal has once more pushed back the frontiers of our knowledge of the Middle Ages in Spain, and reconstructed one small world of medieval life and letters. This time he does for Spain what Faral undertook for France and Bonifacio for Italy. With his accustomed thoroness and insight he gleans from legal and literary documents, from cash accounts and song-books, all that we can know of the Spanish minstrel, whether itinerant singer begging of his cross-roads audiences, or pensioned and honored servant of noble and king. Some of the material had been previously divulged by Amador de los Ríos, Milá, or others, but much is entirely new. Milá's *De los Trovadores en España* (*Obras,* II) was limited almost entirely to the activities of the Provençal troubadour in Spain, while the present book pursues the history of the native Castilian, Portuguese, and Aragonese minstrel as well. Moreover, Sr. Pidal is interested primarily in the *juglar,* not the *trovador;* in the reciter and musician, not the poet. He revives that picturesque figure, his habits, reputation, clothes, musical instruments, rewards, legal status, pleasures, evil and good habits, yet it is the *public* aspects of his existence in which the author seeks his real significance. From his function as a purveyor of diversion to all classes derive the special qualities of the minstrel's art and his importance to literary history.

As in some of his previous books, Sr. Menéndez Pidal reveals here not only the brain of a great scholar, but the soul of an artist. More than fifty half-tones, reproduced from carefully chosen illuminations of early manuscripts, depict the minstrel in his varied functions, and show us his musical instruments as they actually were. This is a valuable feature which other treatises have neglected.

The work is divided into four parts. Part I, *Los Juglares en general,* defines the term: the *juglar* was not always a merry beggar, as Menéndez Pelayo thought; he was not even poor, sometimes. His office united money-taking with public amusement: "*juglares eran todos los que se ganaban la vida actuando ante un público*" (p. 3). From this definition the author traces the Latin, Germanic, and Arabic predecessors of the *juglar.* This name is first met in 1116; *trobador* appears in Castile in 1197. The latter, as is well known, held a higher social rank than the former, who was at first merely the professional performer of the troubadour's

compositions. But the various categories of *juglares,* here carefully defined (*segrer, ministril, zaharrón, remedador, cazurro,* and the women *juglaresa, soldadera, cantadera*), included some genuine creative poets, some wretched buffoons, and some mere players of instruments. Unlike Faral, Sr. Pidal finds evidence of specialization into distinct sub-trades; no one minstrel could unite all the talents which the troubadours ascribed to the ideal *juglar.* Moreover, so far as the Spanish documents testify, the narrative minstrels (*juglares de gesta*) did not exercise themselves in lyric poetry. There follows a detailed and welcome description of the musical instruments of the day, *vihuela, cedra, citola, trompa, atambor, laúd, rabel,* and others. Here the pictures equal the text in value.

The extended travels of many minstrels, the fixed and honorable posts of others, their use as vehicles of propaganda for kings or cities, like a modern publicity agent,[1] their extreme popularity as entertainers, which led to edicts in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries limiting the amount they could be paid; the presents they received in money or in goods; their duties at castle feasts and church solemnities; in all these subjects well-documented testimony shows that the *juglar* united in himself the functions of the movie, radio, novel, and newspaper of our time. The rascalities and vice of many brought against them laws sporadically harsh, perhaps never enforced. Much space is devoted to the wandering *juglar.* Castilian and Galician roamed the Peninsula, and the Provençal troubadour was a welcome visitor at the courts of Castile and Aragon. There are records, too, of visits from German, Italian, Northern French, and Mussulman minstrels; the last were even employed as musicians in Catholic festivals.

Part II is entitled *Noticia general de los Juglares en España, especialmente de los Cantores de Lírica cortesana.* There is reason to believe that *juglares* existed long before their first mention in 1116. At the court of Alfonso VII (1126-1157) both the Galician and Provençal schools were represented, and from then to the

[1] The propagandist conception of the medieval poet has been receiving especial attention of late. *Cf.* P. M. Boissonnade, *Du nouveau sur la Chanson de Roland,* Paris, 1923; and C. Viñas Mey, *Sobre el origen e influencia de los cantares de gesta,* in *Revista de archivos,* 1922, 1924, and more to follow.

fifteenth century it is possible to trace the steps of famous players and singers at the courts of every Christian kingdom in the Peninsula. Provençal art appealed only to cultured initiates; the artistic pleasures of the vulgar were purveyed by lowlier singers of native origin. The Galician lyrics are in every way closer to the people than the Languedocian; among other details of feeling and language, there is the purely formal one of irregular lines, set against the carefully counted ones of the latter.

One trait of the lyric *juglares* is repeatedly noted: their lives were more interesting than their poems, and they left behind them names and distinct personalities. Strikingly opposite is the case with the narrative *juglares.* In the rare cases where their creations are preserved, as well as in the many where we know them only at second hand, their names have been lost almost without exception, and their lives always.

The court lyric in the Castilian tongue is carried by Sr. Menéndez Pidal back to the time of Alfonso X. As it gradually came into prominence and the Galician mode declined, the minstrel passed into the background. In the days of Juan Ruiz he still flourished mightily:[2] then his satirical side outgrew the lyrical, the very name *juglar* fell into disuse, we find at court that *trovador* meant any poet, and *ministril* any musician. But the *juglar* survived among the people.

A special section is devoted to the *juglar cazurro,* whose means of diversion were of the most facile sort. Yet the author takes pleasure in pointing out that the repertory of a certain fifteenth-century *cazurro,* a medley of whose quips and quotations has been by chance preserved, is saturated with "espíritu satírico-moralizador, mostrándose [el autor] fuertemente poseído de esa austeridad que tanto domina en la literatura española, aun en la más picaresca" (p. 307).

The third part (*Los Juglares de Poesía Narrativa*) involves a condensed sketch of the history of epic poetry in Spain. The reviewer does not fully accept the identifications which Sr. Pidal makes in this work and elsewhere, of *legendary* heroic material with *poetic* heroic material. The early Latin chronicles include

[2] The pages on Hitat (264-275; 298-300) are among the most valuable in this book. They offer a new interpretation of the *Libro de buen amor* as a poem both *juglaresque* and *goliardesque.*

fanciful stories of certain prominent figures, but tradition possesses other vehicles than epics in the vulgar tongue. Too often a "sin duda" conceals a breach in the evidence. This question will be discussed elsewhere soon by the reviewer. At present he will limit himself to noting main items in this most important section, which is, the author tells us, soon to be amplified to an extensive literary history.

Sr. Pidal emphasizes the obvious contrast between the anonymity of the epics and the firmly outlined personality of most tyric *juglares*. He believes that the two professions were kept distinct. But in fact so little is known of the *juglares de gesta* that we cannot even be sure whether or not the same minstrels who recited or sang the epics were the authors of them.

The development of the epic, then, not of the inscrutable narrative minstrel, is chiefly to be traced. The Chronicles known as the Pseudo-Isidore (1025?) and the Najerense (1160?, Cirot's *Chronique léonaise*) are exhibited as the earliest repositories of epic matter. Here the author emphasizes an opinion he has expressed before, but which is not yet widely known: that the earliest epic poems were relatively short, say of some 500 lines.[3] But he strenuously resists (and rightly, in the reviewer's opinion) the facile assumption that these postulated narrative poems were related in style, length, or origin to the *romances* of the fifteenth century (pp. 324, 325). In fact, Sr. Pidal enumerates (pp. 371-373) five types of heroic poem preserved in the *Primera Crónica General,* tho some of the distinctions are rather subtle.

The different heroic themes are outlined, their changes traced through successive generations of minstrels: after about 1200 no new epic themes were sung, and poets confined themselves to reworking old ones.[4] The irregular meter of the epics is once more

[3] He goes beyond the Spanish field, and asserts (pp. 325, 454) that such short poems, tho lost, must have existed in France before the long French epics which we possess could have been formed.

[4] So the text, p. 374: "desde la segunda mitad del siglo XII, los juglares no hallan ya en la vida actual incitantes para la creación poética, y . . . se aplican sólo a rehacer los poemas anteriores." I believe, however, that "siglo XII" is a misprint for "siglo XIII." The latest *subjects* are of the twelfth century, but I take it that the author is alluding rather to original creative *activities* of the minstrels, and wishes to place them in the thirteenth.

affirmed: but why call it an "imperfect technique" (p. 343) when it was merely a *different* technique? English and German verse does not count syllables, but that does not make its system imperfect.

The use of poetic sources is treated here at length and with the latest information; nowhere else can this material be found brought together. In like manner, says Sr. Pidal, the fifteenth-century *romances* were utilized as source-material by contemporary *Crónicas* (*de Juan II,* etc.), with the important distinction that the latter reveal the fragmentary, episodical character of these sources, whereas the "largos relatos épicos" consulted by the thirteenth-century chroniclers display "unidad de pensamiento poético." And so the *juglar narrativo* disappears into the wretched blind beggar of our day. The first writer to mention the creations of the *juglar* was the Archbishop Rodrigo ("histrionum fabulis," 1243). In the sixteenth century Argote de Molina and others constantly cite *romances,* but never allude to any, even a nameless, author. For them the ballads were pure disembodied tradition.[5]

Part IV (*Invención y Tradición juglarescas*) sums up the theory of the field surveyed, and contains so many new and suggestive ideas that one can hardly do more here than advise the reading of it, for a summarization is scarcely possible. But the burden of the entire work is that popular and traditional art derives its peculiar and enduring charm from its quality as *public diversion.* Being destined for the people, for a crowd, it could stress only the broadest, humanest art, and must lay aside all esoteric refinement and its accompanying *personality* (in the literal sense). Hence the national, impersonal character of the epic. Hence the constant renewal of youth in the juglaresque forms, as they underwent continual changes at the hands of one poet after another. And this perpetual renovation, this traditional creation, took place not only in oral tradition, as in ballads, but also in written tradition, as in the longer narrative poems. "Toda obra que se reproduce en variantes o en refundiciones es obra en que colaboran varios autores, es un producto colectivo; y una obra reelaborada

[5] The *romance* of the *Cancionero de Stúñiga,* "Retrayda estaba la Reina," is still spoken of by Sr. Pidal as by the poet Carvajal (p. 419), altho it has been shown that no good reason is evident for attributing it to him (*Romanic Review,* VII, 75-77).

tradicionalmente por varios autores, sea oralmente, sea por escrito, reviste caracteres esenciales de anonimia y popularidad" (p. 450).

If there are certain links in the logic that may appear too finely drawn, and some assertions that seem aprioristic,[6] the whole forms a body of powerful argument and deduction, which provoke thought and compel admiration.

The nine Appendices contain documents cited in the text. The most important, perhaps, is No. III, the "Fragmentos del programa de un juglar cazurro." Menéndez Pidal himself first called attention to these chance jottings, in 1898, and Ducamin utilized the MS. for his edition of the *Libro de buen amor,* but they appear entire now for the first time.

The foregoing rough résumé conveys no notion of the richness of detail, the wealth of fresh points of view, which illuminate this work. Some of the *obiter dicta* flash out side-lights quite as arresting as any of the formal arguments. The following merit quotation by reason of their far-reaching implications.

> . . . gracias a reposadas conversaciones de paseo con J. Ribera, [me he] penetrado al fin de la íntima convicción de éste acerca de la gran influencia del arte musulmán sobre el cristiano (pp. 137-138).
>
> Reiteradas veces he intentado pensar dentro de la corriente actual que propende a modernizar la fecha de los poemas épicos, pero siempre he tropezado con tales dificultades que me he convencido de que tal corriente es, en multitud de casos, una moda que no me interesa seguir (p. 322, n. 2).

In a like casual manner, the author drops allusions to his projected future studies, and one learns that he has planned the following: a chrestomathy of early Castilian lyrics (185, n. 2); a history of the Spanish epic (313), which may include, presumably, studies of the epics of Fernando el Magno and the Infantes de Lara as they appear through the medium of the *Crónica de 1344* (385, n. 2; 405, n. 1), and the more detailed investigation of the traditional character of the long epic poems (444, 450, n. 1); a *Vida del Cid* (394, n. 2); an examination of the date of the *Juego trobado* in the *Cancionero general* (422, n. 2). Add the long-an-

[6] As, that a work especially well written would necessarily be left unchanged by later minstrels (p. 448-449); or that literature intended for a loosely knit public would tend to acquire universal interest—when it is admitted that much work destined for the people is beneath consideration as literature at all (438-441).

nounced *Romancero,* and one must conclude that this marvelous scholar sees a score of tasks calling to be done, and no one but himself willing and equipped to do them.

Unexpectedly, the routine features of the book are the most disappointing. The *Índice alfabético* is far from complete. There is no general Bibliography, and that provided in the foot-notes, usually most detailed, sometimes fails the inexperienced reader when he most needs it. Thus, he will look in vain to learn where the often-mentioned Pseudo-Isidorian Chronicle may be read, or the *Najerense,* or Giraut Riquier's *Suplicató,* or King Alfonso's *Declaratió.* Additional cross-references are sadly needed in places.[7] The author has reached the stage where certain material has become so much a part of his daily life that he can hardly realize the needs of the less-informed. It is a weakness not rare in those whose passion for research is stronger than their gift for popularization.

S. GRISWOLD MORLEY.

University of California.

CORRESPONDENCE

NEW CHAUCER ITEMS

In the *Life Records* of Chaucer (1900, p. 319) there is printed a document dated April 6, 1396, with the following heading: "Deed by Gregory Ballard, appointing Chaucer and others, as his attorneys, to take seisin for him of certain lands in Kent, of which he had been enfeoffed by the Archbishop of York" (from *Cal. Close Rolls,* 19 RII., m. 8d.).

Three other related documents containing Chaucer's name in the recently printed *Calendar of Close Rolls* (1392-96) have seemingly been overlooked. Not only do these entries shed new light on the item of the *Life Records,* but they make possible certain inferences.

The first record is: "Thomas de Arundell archbishop of York and papal legate to William archbishop of Canterbury, Robert

[7] Thus, on p. 9 the statement is made that the name *juglar* first appears in Spain in 1116, but the documentation for this fact can be found only after some search, on p. 328, n. 1.

One misses an exact description of the script and of the probable date of the important fragments of *cazurro* verses (Appendix III), none is provided either here or in any of the works refered to.

bishop of London, John bishop of Salisbury, John lord Lovell, Thomas Percy, Richard Abberbury, Robert Cherleton, Philip de Vache knights, John Scarle, William atte Wode, Simon Dudyngton clerks, Robert Stokley, William Gascoigne and John Woderoue, their heirs and assigns. Charter with warranty of the manor called Spitelcombe, two water mills and all other lands, rents, services, waters, fisheries, wards, reliefs, etc. in Combe called Westcombe and Spitelcombe, and in Estgrenewyche, Cherleton, Wrytelmersshe and Depford co. Kent, which the grantor had by feoffment of William Staundoun and Agnes his wife by charter and fine levied in the king's court, also 4 acres 3 roods 13 perches of land with ditches etc. adjacent in Hornemersshe in the parish of Estgrenewyche which he had by feoffment of John Longe, John Cooke and Alice his wife. Witnesses: Geoffrey Chaucer, Hugh de Midelton, Richard Rowe, John Fox, Thomas Baker, William Couper, John Longe, William Symond of Grenewyche, John Cheseman of Depford. Dated Combe, 21 February 18 Richard II (1395).

Memorandum of acknowledgment at the New Temple Church London 24 February before Peter de Barton clerk, by virtue of a *dedimus potestatem* which is on the file for this year. (*Cal. Close Rolls,* 1392-96, pp. 402 f.)."

The next: "Thomas de Arundell archbishop of York and papal legate to Henry de Wynchestre chaplain and John Norwych. Letter of attorney, appointing them to receive seisin of the whole manor called 'Spitelcombe'" etc. (Witnesses as above). (Dated 5 March 1395, 19 Richard II (1396).

Memorandum of acknowledgment, 1 May. (*Cal. Close Rolls,* 1392-96, pp. 502 f.)."

The third is that given in the *Life Records* (p. 319).

And the fourth: "Thomas de Arundell archbishop of York and papal legate to Gregory Ballard, his heirs and assigns. Charter of the whole manor of Spitelcombe, etc. (Witnesses as above in the first and second). Dated Combe, 6 April 1396, 19 Richard II.

Memorandum of acknowledgment, 1 May." (*Ibid.,* p. 508).

These records make possible some conclusions: (a) The entry in the *Life Records* obviously takes on a new meaning; (b) It is clear that Chaucer was looked upon as a man of consequence, otherwise his name would not head the list of witnesses; (c) Among those associated with him was one of considerable interest, Sir Philip Vache, an intimate friend of the poet; (d) To all appearances Chaucer's relations with the church were not unfriendly; (e) With his king the poet's relations were also obviously close: when Ballard was appointed by the Archbishop of York to succeed Wynchestre as attorney on April 6, 1396—which is made clear elsewhere (cf. *Cal. Close Rolls,* 1392-96, p. 497)—Chaucer was, on that very day, given the power of attorney by Ballard. The poet's

standing is seen in the fact that Ballard was Richard's esquire and butler (*cf. Cal. Pat. Rolls,* 1388-92, p. 459); (f) Further evidence is offered that Chaucer was at this time living at Greenwich. It does not seem possible that a transaction involving the transfer of a manor [1] and lands in and near Greenwich should have taken place in which one of the chief persons concerned was an outsider. At least three of the other witnesses can be identified as residents of that vicinity.[2] This fact, then, together with other well known evidence, all but proves Chaucer's connection with Greenwich.

ERNEST KUHL.

Goucher College.

NOTES ON THE OCCURRENCE OF THE SONNET AND BLANK VERSE

Certainly not the least important of the contributions made by Professor Raymond D. Havens in his *Influence of Milton on English Poetry* is the information concerning the occurrence of the sonnet and of blank verse. Of the sonnet, Mr. Havens writes (p. 488, f. n.) "I have come upon only five or six writers between 1660 and 1700." In view of this statement, a sonnet which appeared in July, 1692, in the monthly journal entitled *The State of Europe,* seems worth reprinting, as it has escaped notice until now. The journalist wrote this introduction:

"There was a Sonnet made at the time when K. *James* lay at *Cherburgh,* and that they were making so many Prayers for him at *Rome,* which I though very proper to insert in this place.

Sur l'Armament de Mer de Cherbourgh.
Sonnet."

The French original is given, and the English version is thus announced: "*In English thus.*"

What means this Coyle upon the Gallick Shore,
  While the o'erburthen'd Sea the weight bewails
Of fierce *Bellona's* pond'rous Arsenals?
  Where will the gloomy Cloud this Deluge pour?
'Tis to enforce a Passage o'er the Sea,
  The English to subdue by new Exploits;
Great *Lewis* for a Royal Exile fights,
  And *Albion,* drench'd in Bloud, must *France* obey.

---

[1] See index to *Cal. Close Rolls* (1392-96) under Greenwich for exact location of the property.

[2] John Fox was of East G. In April, 1396, he was asked to make inquiries concerning the dikes and ditches along the Thames (cf. Chaucer in 1390) (*ibid.,* p. 504). Midelton (*ibid.,* p. 411) and Symond (*ibid.,* p. 403) were from Greenwich.

> **Who can withstand our Power, cries Haughty Pride,**
> **The Dutch *Nassau!* or his Rebellious Train!**
> **No— we have Strength and Prudence on our Side.**
> **But Heav'n, while vaunting Mortals stood amaz'd,**
> **Spoke to the Winds, and they in *France* retain**
> **Those Arms against Heav'ns sacred Altars rais'd.[1]**

Other minor periodicals contain stray blank verse poems which Mr. Havens has not noted. Before 1725 the following poems had appeared:

1701. "An Elegy on Mrs. H." In Dunton's *Post-Angel,* February, 1701, and extending over three pages, with this prefatory note:

> "Sir, I thought not only Pastoral, but vulgar Heroick, too mean for your Wife, who I ever accounted one of the *best of her Sex,* and therefore have composed her Elegy in *Milton's* Verse, in a Dialogue of *Angels;* which is all from
>
> Your Hearty Friend and Servant,
>
> M. S."

1707. "Of the inconveniency, and in contempt of Rhime." *The Monthly Miscellany, or memoirs for the curious,* May, 1707, pp. 151-3. This is in blank verse, except for the last twelve lines, which are in praise of Milton!

1711. "Horat. Lib. 3. Od. 16." Translated into Blank Verse by Thirsis. 72 lines. In *Delights for the Ingenious, or a monthly entertainment for the curious of both sexes,* no. for Oct., Nov., Dec. 1711.

1724. "An Essay on Death." 33 lines. In *The Observator,* no. 7, Jan. 18, 1724.

1724. "An Essay in Miltonick Verse." 44 lines. In the *Protestant Advocate,* Dec. 21, 1724.

R. P. McCutcheon.

Tulane University.

Wieland's Letter to Kleist.

In Wieland's well-known letter to Kleist occurs a sentence which, so far as I have observed, is regularly quoted by writers on Kleist in the following form: "Sie müssen Ihren Guiskard vollenden, und wenn der ganze Kaukasus und Alles [*or* alles] auf

[1] The State of Europe, July, 1692, pp. 238-9.

Sie drückte." Thus most recently Maria Prigge-Kruhoeffer, in her essay in the *Jahrbuch der Kleist-Gesellschaft 1923 und 1924*, p. 50.

It seems to me probable, however, that what Wieland actually wrote was "und wenn der ganze Kaukasus und Atlas auf Sie drückte." To add to the Caucasian peaks the African "pillars of heaven" would be climactic, like piling Pelion on Ossa. On the other hand, it would be anticlimactic and weak, not to say puerile, to write "the whole Caucasus and everything." The entire context, which is quoted in full by Eduard von Bülow,[1] demands a forceful and concrete expression.

In his edition of Kleist's letters, Minde-Pouet[2] reprints part of Wieland's letter; like Bülow, he reads "Alles," and, like Bülow, he cites as authority the version of this letter which was published in *Orpheus*, a Nürnberg periodical, in 1824.[3] Both Bülow and Minde-Pouet appear to have had direct knowledge of *Orpheus*. It is hardly to be assumed that they both misread the printed version. It would seem, therefore, that the misreading, as I believe it may be called, is over a century old.

Harvard University. WALTER SILZ.

THE *Don Carlos* THEME

To the excellent bibliography of works dealing with the *Don Carlos* theme prefixed by Dr. F. W. C. Lieder to his edition of Schiller's *Don Carlos*[1] should be added the following: (1) *Karel, Erf-prins van Spanje; Treurspel.* Te Amsteldam, 1753. (Preface bears date 1679; licensed 1728, 1743, 1752.) Play by Govard Bidloo (1649-1713). (2) *Elizabeth de France.* Paris, 1838. Play by Doigny du Ponceau (1750?-1838). (3) *Les fils de Charles-Quint.* Paris, 1864. Play by Victor Séjour (1816-1874).

George Washington University. HENRY GRATTAN DOYLE.

---

[1] *Heinrich von Kleists Leben und Briefe*, Berlin (Besser), 1848, p. 37. Hermann Behme, *Heinrich von Kleist und C. M. Wieland*, Heidelberg (Winter), 1914, p. 10, quotes from Bülow.

[2] Kleist's *Werke*, Leipzig & Wien (Bibliog. Inst.), 1905 ff., vol. v, 470 f.

[3] The letter there published, dated April 10, 1804, embodies a restoration, based on a "Concept," of the letter of nine months earlier.

[1] New York: 1912, pp. xlix-lxxiv (Expanded from his article in *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, vol. IX, no. 4).

Verlainian Verse in Favart

The eighteenth century, it seems, would not be the most likely place to look for a precursor of that musical and impressionistic type of verse which is usually styled "Verlainian." Barre in *Le Symbolisme* (Ch. II) has pointed out certain poets of the seventeenth century, the musical spontaneity of whose verse approximates that of Verlaine. Verlainian verse even more unmistakable than that to which Barre refers is to be found in the works of Favart (1710-1792),[1] whose preoccupation with the music of verse is not surprising since he himself was a musician. Some of his poetry is simply versified music, although it is not like Verlaine's, so profoundly suggestive of emotion. I cite here a characteristic example from Favart of that mellifluous and lulling verse of which Verlaine is the undisputed master.

Cet étang
Qui s'étend
Dans la plaine,
Répète au sein des eaux
Ces verdoyans ormeaux
Où le pampre s'enchaîne.

Un jour pur,
Un azur
Sans nuages,
Vivement s'y réfléchit!
Le tableau s'enrichit
D'images.

Mais tandis que l'on admire,
Cette onde où le ciel se mire
Un zéphir
Vient ternir
La surface
De la glace.
D'un souffle il confond les traits
Détruit tous les effets;
L'éclat de tant d'objets.

Un soupir,
Un désir,
O ma fille!
Peut ainsi troubler un coeur
Où se peint la candeur
Où la sagesse brille.

Le repos
Sur ces eaux
Peut renaître;
Mais il se perd sans retour
Dans un coeur dont l'amour
Est maître.

(*La Rosière de Salencie;* p. 8, ed. of 1770.)

It will be noted that the third stanza rather breaks down; its burden is too heavy for the tenuous structure of the verse. But the rest of the poem, particularly the opening stanza—evocative of a Corot painting—strikes the true Verlainian note. One is reminded of Verlaine's *Chanson d'Automne* of which the succession of masculine and feminine rhymes is identical with the rhyme scheme of Favart's poem.

[1] On Favart see Font, *Essai sur Favart et les origines de la comédie mêlée de chant*, Toulouse, 1894.

Les sanglots longs
Des violons
De l'automne
Blessent mon coeur
D'une langueur
Monotone, etc.

LEO ROBERTS.

Johns Hopkins University.

BRIEF MENTION

Eine Lautverschiebungstheorie, von N. Otto Heinertz. *Lunds Universitets Årsskrift.* N. F. Avd. 1. Bd 20. Nr. 7. Lund and Leipzig, 1925. The author takes as his motto this quotation from Jespersen: "how much easier it is to advance hypotheses than to find truth." And throughout he exhibits a becoming modesty which contrasts strongly with the cocksureness of so many theorists. Thus, on p. 3 he tells us, "Theorien [der lautverschiebung] hat es also genug gegeben, vor allem in dem letzten vierteljahrhundert, in den allermeisten fällen hat aber jede theorie nur einen anhänger gehabt—den urheber. Vielleicht wird mich mit meiner neuen erklärung dasselbe schicksal treffen. Nun, ich werde mich gelassen darein finden—ich habe viele schicksalsbrüder." No reviewer can deal harshly with one who writes in such a spirit. And this all the more since the author has done a thorough job and has worked up a plausible case (as one would expect of a Swedish scholar).

The monograph (only 84 pages long) begins with a survey of previous explanations of the Germanic and the High German sound-shifts. Here I miss the important treatise of E. Prokosch, *Die indogermanische Media Aspirata* (published in *Modern Philology,* XV 621 ff., XVI 99 ff., 325 ff., 543 ff.; see especially XVI 547); Mr. Heinertz does not seem to be acquainted with this monograph, though he mentions Mr. Prokosch's earlier paper on *Die deutsche Lautverschiebung und die Völkerwanderung* (published in the *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* XVI 1 ff.). He classifies the explanations of his predecessors into three groups: the psychological, physiological and ethnographical theories. Grimm affords an amusing example of group one; he connects the sound-shift "mit dem gewaltigen, das mittelalter eröffnenden vorschritt und freiheitsdrang der Deutschen." The most familiar physiological explanation, of course, is that which accounts for the sound-shift as the result of an increase in expiratory energy. Mr. Heinertz himself belongs to the third group; he explains the

sound-shift as a result of racial mixture, the non-Germanic race that did the work being the Celts. He is to be distinguished from his predecessors in two respects at least: first, he separates the Germanic and the High German sound-shifts with the utmost stringency and confines himself to the latter; secondly, he works out the Celtic hypothesis (which is by no means original with him) in such detail that he makes it peculiarly his. As I have said, he makes out a good case, but his fundamental assumption, viz., that the Germanic and the High German sound-shifts are *wesensverschieden,* is too hard for me, at least, to swallow, in view of the great similarities that exist (alongside differences) between them. K. M.

Boswell's Note Book 1776-1777 (Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1925, $1.20). One of the treasures of Mr. R. B. Adam's great Johnson collection at Buffalo is a small notebook on some eighteen pages of which Boswell recorded jottings of Johnson's conversation. These are now made available, in a new volume of the excellent *Oxford Miscellany,* with the corresponding passages of the *Life* printed on opposite pages. The two accounts should be compared by every student of Boswell or of the art of biography. The care with which the original notes were later verified, amplified, or corrected is no less noteworthy than the skill with which earlier and later memoranda were interwoven with other material and transferred to different parts of the finished work. Any one who still thinks that Boswell's success was due mainly to persistence and a good memory and that he gave Johnson's exact words should study this book, observing how the conversation on pages 22 and 23 reappears in the *Life* as a single speech and comparing the two accounts of Bentley's verses (p. 24) as well as the two following passages:

He had put Lord Gower into his Dictionary under the word *Renegade* (alluding to his having deserted the old Jacobite interest I doubt not) He had mentioned sometimes they say *a Gower* (*Note Book,* p. 1).

"You know, Sir, Lord Gower forsook the old Jacobite interest. When I came to the word *Renegado,* after telling that it meant 'one who deserts to the enemy, a revolter,' I added, *Sometimes we say a* GOWER" (*Life,* ed. Hill, i. 296).

R. D. H.

The Ancient Rhetorical Theories of the Laughable, by Mary A. Grant (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, No. 21). According to the ancient notion rhetoric was the sub-

ject which dealt with persuasion. Involved in this general conception would be many methods by which persuasion could be attained. One of the most useful of these methods, one that is instinctively used by orators, is the employment of the laughable in arguments. The opponent's case tumbles when the audience can be persuaded to laugh at it. "Cervantes laughed Spain's chivalry away." Very early in the development of rhetoric writers began to notice this phenomenon and to comment upon it. Gradually they formed theories and a pedagogy of application.

Miss Grant has carefully examined these theories as found in the writings of the Pre-Socratic philosophers, the Sophists and Plato, Aristotle, and later rhetoricians. She has subjected the works of Cicero and Quintilian to a close analysis in order to determine what views their authors might have had concerning laughter in the court-room and the political arena. As a result of her study she is convinced that the ancients "clearly differentiated the types of laughter, studied the motives behind each, and recognized certain ethical principles in their formulation of the liberal and illiberal jests."

In her treatment of laughter Miss Grant does not confine herself to its use by the orator; for she turns to the poets, the dramatists, and the satirists in search of additional evidence of the appreciation of humor by the ancients. At this point persuasion is abandoned in favor of some larger definition of rhetoric. In the end human beings are found to be influenced and affected by queer situations, by humorous turns, by comic motions, by ridicule, by irony and by other means which arouse laughter. Back of all she thinks is a propriety which favors the use of good-natured humor.

Having presented admirably the theories of the ancients concerning laughter Miss Grant might render a further service to future orators by showing in detail the effects of laughter, how causes have been won and lost, how old ideas have been uprooted, indeed how justice and progress and goodwill have been served by "Laughter holding both his sides."

B. S.

Main Currents of Modern French Drama, by Hugh Allison Smith (New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1925. xv + 320 pp.) This book is chiefly concerned with the French drama since 1827. Only the leading authors are discussed and the order of treatment is determined by "currents" rather than by chronology, a fact that explains why Rostand is criticized before Scribe. It will be useful to advanced undergraduates and to the general public, for it does not attempt too much, it contains a great deal of information, and its estimates are, as a rule, sound enough. A table of the authors treated, a list of their plays, with dates, and of suggested readings,

and an index add to the value of the volume. But if one looks for more than this, he will be disappointed, for the scholarship of recent years is insufficiently utilized and when the author departs from commonly accepted opinion, he is not convincing. Thus, for instance, he neglects melodrama as it was neglected in the text books of twenty years ago. The slight reference to it on p. 36 is insufficient and to call *La Tour de Nesle* the "father of all melodrama" (p. 39) is misleading. Similarly he pays no attention to the comedy of manners before Dumas fils and mentions neither Allard's *Comédie de mœurs en France,* nor Gaillard's *Emile Augier et la comédie sociale,* either of which would have helped him over this difficulty. On the other hand, his argument for the priority of Dumas fils over Augier in the question of realistic social drama is easily answered, for *Gabrielle,* despite its form, is quite as realistic, if not more so, than the romantic *Dame aux Camélias* and, if we pass beyond these two plays, *Poirier* appeared before the *Demi Monde.*

Becque he finds "discouraging to the maintenance of respectability" (p. 199) and he declares that the "value" of *les Corbeaux* "may be questioned." He regards this play as so excellent an example of the slice of life that he fails to point out the survivals in it of an earlier technique and to show the departures from naturalistic formulae which help to make it, in my opinion, one of the three or four greatest French plays of the century. Despite his obvious admiration for Brieux, he denies him "the ability to entertain by wit or amuse with the comic" (p. 219), thus overlooking a side of him that is exemplified notably in *les Hannetons,* a play mentioned only in the bibliography. Curel suffers still more. *Les Fossiles* is dismissed with scant notice. As the difference between the various versions of the *Repas du lion* is not pointed out, the reader will not understand why the "autocrat" of the analysis has been compared to Hamlet (p. 232). *La nouvelle Idole* is hardly "the most comprehensible" of his plays, for it has been often understood to be a discussion as to whether or not a physician has the right to sacrifice a patient to science. *La Comédie du génie* is nowhere mentioned. Hervieu is described as lacking in sympathy (p. 257) and the fundamental ideas of *le Réveil* and of *Théroigne de Méricourt* are not given. Claudel is not mentioned at all, though not a little space is given to Donnay, Bataille, and Bernstein, authors better known than he in 1905, but who are at present of far less significance.[1]

H. C. L.

[1] P. 24, *Amy Robsart* is forgotten; p. 72, the evolution is interesting, but had already taken place by the time *Polyeucte* and *Horace* had appeared; p. 106, lines 7-9 make no sense; p. 264, *Servir* is not a melodrama. In the account of Hugo's life (p. 23) nothing is said about the years in which he wrote his plays!

INDEX

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Bazalgette, Leon.—Henry Thoreau. Transted by Van Wyck Brooks. *New York:* arcourt, Brace and Co., 1924. $3.00.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine.—The Essays ıd Last Essays of Elia. With an introıction. *London:* Dent and Sons, 1924. 'o. 5s.

Blackie, E. M.—A Most Friendly Fareell to Sir Francis Drake, by Henry Robˈts. Transcribed with a short introducon. *Cambridge:* Harvard University ress, 1924.

Browning, Robert.—Pippa Passes. Edited ɣ A. L. Irvine. *New York:* Oxford Univ. ress, 1924. 84 pp. 45 cts.

Firkins, Oscar W.—William Dean Howls. A Study. *Cambridge:* Harvard Univ. ress, 1924. viii + 356 pp. $4.00.

English Place-Name Society. — Vol. I. art I: Introduction to the Survey of Engsh Place-Names. Ed. by A. Mawer and '. M. Stenton. Part II: The Chief Eleıents used in English Place-Names. Ed. y A. Mawer. *Cambridge:* University 'ress, 1924. 189, 67 pp.

Haferkorn, R.—Gotik und Ruine in der nglischen Dichtung des achtzehnten Jahrunderts. *Leipzig:* Tauchnitz, 1924.

Hamilton, C.—Conversations on Contemıorary Drama. *New York:* The Macmillan 'o., 1924. $2.00.

Hicks, Philip Marshall. — The Developıent of the Natural History Essay in American Literature. Diss. Univ. of Penna., 924.

Hubbard, F. G.—The First Quarto Ediion of Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet. Edited with Introduction and Notes. [Univ. f Wisconsin Studies in Language and Lierature, No. 19.]

Legouis, E. et Cazamian, L.—Histoire de a Littérature Anglaise. *Paris:* Hachette, 1924. 1312 pp. 20 fr.

Morgan, A. E.—Some Problems of Shakepeare's 'Henry the Fourth.' [The Shakespeare Association.] *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press, 1924. 43 pp. $.70.

O'Conor, Norreys J. — Changing Ireland. Literary Backgrounds of the Irish Free State 1889-1922. *Cambridge:* Harvard Univ. Press, 1924. xii + 259 pp. $2.50.

Palaeologus. — Michael Neo-Palaeologus. His Grammar. By His Father Stephen N. Palaeologus. *London:* J. M. Dent and Sons, 1924. 7/6.

Pecock, Reginald.—The Folewer to the Donet. Edited by Elsie V. Hitchcock. [EETS. Or. Series No. 164]. *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press, 1924. lxxx + 263 pp. $12.00.

Paves, A. C. — Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature. Vol. IV, 1923. *Cambridge:* Bowes and Bowes, 1924. 235 pp. 6 s. net.

Reed, Amy L.—The Background of Gray's Elegy. A Study in the Taste for Melancholy Poetry. *New York:* Columbia Univ. Press, 1924. vii + 270 pp. $2.50.

Ripman, Walter.—Good Speech. An Introduction to English Phonetics. *New York:* E. P. Dutton & Co. [1924]. vi + 88 pp. $1.00.

Saintsbury, George. — Collected Essays and Papers, 1875-1920. Vol. IV. Essays in French Literature. *London:* Dent and Sons, 1924. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Schwarz, M.—Alliteration im englischen Kulturleben neuerer Zeit. Hrsg. von Heinrich Spies. Dissertation. *Greifswald:* 1924.

Schweizer, Fr.—Die Ausländer in den Romanen von Dickens. Dissertation, *Giessen:* 1924.

Simpson, Evelyn M. — A Study of the Prose Works of John Donne. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924. vi + 367 pp. $5.00.

Smith, G. C. Moore.—The Poems, English and Latin, of Edward, Lord Herbert of Cherbury. *Oxford:* Clarendon Press, 1924.

Swift, Jonathan.—Selections. Edited by Hardin Craig. *New York:* Charles Scribner's Sons [1924]. xxviii + 448 pp. $1.00.

Vann, William Harvey. — Notes on the Writings of James Howell. *Belton, Texas:* Baylor College, 1924.

Wicksteed, Joseph H.—Blake's Vision of the Book of Job. With reproductions of the illustrations. New and revised edition. *London:* Dent and Sons, 1924. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Williams, Randall.—The Wessex Novels of Thomas Hardy. *London:* Dent and Sons, 1924. 8vo. 6s.

GERMAN

Blumenthal, P.—Erinnerungen an Ernst v. Wildenbruch. *Frankfurt a. O.:* Waldow, 1924. iii + 53 pp. M. 2.50.

Bracher, Hans. — Rahmenerzählung und Verwandtes bei G. Keller, C. F. Meyer und Th. Storm. Ein Beitrag z. Technik der Novelle. *Leipzig:* H. Haessel, 1924. vii + 132 pp. M. 3.

Brink, Louise. — Women Characters in Richard Wagner. Columbia Univ. Diss. [Nervous and Mental Disease Monograph Series No. 37]. *New York:* Nervous and Mental Disease Publ. Co., 1924. xv + 125 pp. $2.00.

Burckhardt, Jakob. — Briefwechsel ——'s mit dem Freiburger Historiker Heinr. Schreiber. Hrsg. v. G. Münsel. [S.-A. aus Basler Zs. f. Gesch. u. Altertum. 22, 1.] *Basel:* B. Schwabe & Co., 1924. iv + 85 pp. M. 3.—.

Ewald, Ferdinand.—Die Entwicklung des K-Suffixes in den indogermanischen Sprachen [Indogerm. Bibliothek, 3. Abt., 4.]. *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1924. vii + 32 pp. M. 1.25.

Hóman, B.—Geschichtliches im Nibelungenlied. [Aus Ungar. Jahrbücher. Bd. 3.] *Berlin:* de Gruyter & Co., 1924. 48 pp. 4°. M. 1.50.

Jahrbuch der Goethe-Gesellschaft. Hrsg. von Max Hecker. Bd. 10. *Weimar:* Goethe-Gesellsch., 1924. iv + 286 pp.

Kindermann, Heinz.—J. M. R. Lenz und die deutsche Romantik. Ein Kapitel aus d. Entwickelungsgeschichte romant. Wesens u. Schaffens. *Wien:* W. Braumüller, 1925. xviii + 367 pp. M. 10.

Kluckhohn, Paul.—Die deutsche Romantik. *Bielefeld:* Velhagen & Klasing, 1924. viii + 286 pp. M. 6.50.

Koller, Armin H.—Herder's Conception of Milieu [Repr. from JEGP. XXIII, 217-240, 370-388]. *Urbana:* Univ. of Illinois, 1924.

Korrodi, Ed.—Schweizerdichtung der Gegenwart. [Die Schweiz im deu. Geistesleben. Bd. 32.] *Leipzig:* H. Haessel, 1924. 83 pp. M. 1.40.

Pauli, Johannes. — Schimpf und Ernst, hrsg. von Johannes Bolte. Tl. 2. [Alte Erzähler, Tl. 2.]. *Berlin:* Herbert Stubenrauch, 1924. 45 + 512 pp. Bound, M. 25.

Petersen, Jul.—Die Entstehung der Eckermannischen Gespräche und ihre Glaubwürdigkeit [Abh. d. preuss. Akad. Jg. 1924, Phil. hist. Kl. Nr. 2]. *Berlin:* de Gruyter & Co., 1924. 87 pp. 4°. M. 2.50.

Rudwin, Maximilian J.—A Historical and Bibliographical Survey of the German Religious Drama [Univ. of Pittsburgh Studies in Language and Literature]. *Pittsburgh:* Univ. of Pittsburgh, 1924. xxiii + 286 pp. $3.25.

Schmidt, Erich.—Richardson, Rousseau u. Goethe. Ein Beitrag zur Gesch. des Romans im 18. Jh. Obraldruck d. Aufl. v. 1875. *Jena:* Frommann, 1924. viii + 331 pp. Cloth, M. 7.50.

Schwentner, Ernst.—Die primären Interjektionen in den indogermanische Sprachen, mit bes. Berücksichtigung des Griechischen, Lateinischen und Germanischen [Indogerm. Bibliothek, 3. Abt., 5.]. *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1924. x + 68 pp. M. 2.50.

Seuffert, Bernhard.—Mörikes Nolten und Mozart, betrachtet für G. Haberlandt zum 28. Nov. 1924. *Graz:* Leuschner & Lubensky, 1924. 41 pp. M. 1.30.

Stefan, Paul.—Hofmannsthal. Eine i[illegible]ginäre Ansprache. *Wien:* Wiener lit. Ans[illegible] 1924. 108 pp. M. 1.

Stolze, Reinhold.—Die wissenschaftli[illegible] Grundlagen der Inszenierung von Heb[illegible] "Maria Magdalene." [Hebbel-Forschun[illegible] Nr. 13]. *Berlin:* B. Behr, 1924. 74 [illegible] M. 2.50.

Treblin, Martin.—Der Dichter Eberh[illegible] König. 2. Aufl. *Leipzig:* Matthes, 1[illegible] 55 pp. M. 1.50.

Wadepuhl, Walter.—Goethes Stellung [illegible] französischen Romantik [*Urbana, Ill.*] 1924. 62 pp.

Wedekind, Frank. — Gesammelte Bri[illegible] (Hrsg. v. Fritz Strich). Bd. 1. 2. *Münch[illegible]* G. Müller, 1924. 358, 392 pp. M. 10.

Wildenbruch, Ernst v. — Der Onkel a[illegible] Pommern. Zwei Humoresken, hrsg. v. [illegible] Wichmann. *New York:* Oxford Univ. Pr[illegible] 1922. 88 pp.

Ziesemer, Walther. — Die ostpreussisc[illegible] Mundarten. Proben u. Darstellung. *Br[illegible]lau:* Ferd. Hirt, 1924. v + 136 pp. M. 4.[illegible]

FRENCH

Aynard, J.—Les Poëtes lyonnais pré[illegible]seurs de la Pléiade. Scève, Labé, Perne[illegible] Du Guillet. *Paris:* Bossard, 1924. 300 p[illegible]

Barrès, M. — Quelques lettres politiq[illegible] inédites, présentées par J. Caplain. *Paris* Goulet, 1924. 31 pp.

Beaumarchais.—Lettres de jeunesse (174[illegible]-1775), publ. par L. Thomas. *Paris:* Bo[illegible]sard, 1923. 292 pp.

Bellaigue, Louise de. — Le Brodequin [illegible] Talma. *Tours:* Mame, 1924. 167 pp.

Boyer, F.—La Bibliothèque de Stendhal à Rome. *Paris:* Champion, 1923. 16 pp.

Catalogue gén. des livres impr. de la Bibl. nat. T. 80. Just-Kemp-Welch. *Paris:* Impr. nat., 1924. 626 pp.

Charles d'Orléans. — Poésies, éd. par P. Champion. *Paris:* Champion, 1923. xxxv + 292 pp. Fr. 14.

Crosby, Emily A.—Une romancière oubliée, Mme Riccoboni. *Paris:* Rieder, 1924. 191 pp. Fr. 12.

Cyrano de Bergerac. — Lettres d'amour. *Paris:* France-Edition, 1924. 176 pp. Fr. 3.50.

Droin, A.—M. Paul Valéry et la tradition poétique fr. *Paris:* Flammarion, 1923. 189 pp. Fr. 5.

Estève, E.—A. de Vigny, sa pensée et son art. *Paris:* Garnier, 1923. 327 pp. Fr. 10.

Farrère, C.—Ma dernière visite à Loti. *Abbeville:* Paillart, 1923. 90 pp.

Giraud, V. — La Vie héroïque de Blaise Pascal. *Paris:* Crès, 1923. 273 pp. Fr. 7.50.

Guyot, H.—Anthologie des lettres des femmes. T. I. 1500-1774. *Paris:* Delagrave, 1923. 435 pp.

Lauer, Ph. — Bibliothèque nat. Cat. des mss. de la coll. Clairambault. T. I. *Paris:* Leroux, 1923. 431 pp.

Le Breton, A.—Balzac. *Paris:* Boivin, 1923. 239 pp.

Martellière, J.—P. de Ronsard, gentilhomme vendômois. *Paris:* Lemerre, 1924. 286 pp. Fr. 15.

Maurras, Ch.—Anatole France politique et poète. *Paris:* Plon-Nourrit, 1924. 251 pp. Fr. 5.

Meyer, E.—Diderot. *Paris:* Boivin, 1923. 239 pp.

Platard, J.—L'Adolescence de Rabelais en Poitou. *Paris:* Belles-Lettres, 1923. xii + 219 pp. Fr. 10.

Ronsard.—Œuvres complètes, éd. par H. Vaganay. T. V et VI. *Paris:* Garnier, 1923. 422 et iv + 566 pp.

——. Les Amours, éd. par. P. Laumonier, T. I et II. *Paris:* Lemerre. 255 et 254 pp. Fr. 3.50 each.

Schwarz, H. S.—An Outline History of French literature. *New York:* Knopf, 1924. 173 pp.

Silvestre, C.—Jean Nesmy. L'homme et l'œuvre. *Dijon:* Publications "Lumière," 1923. 185 pp. Fr. 3.50.

Simon, Ch.—Stendhal et la police autrichienne. *Paris:* Champion, 1923. 17 pp.

Vaganay, H.—Les Odes pindariques après Ronsard. *Mâcon:* Protat, 1923. 16 pp.

ITALIAN

Cappuccio, C.—Folgore da S. Gemignano e Cene da la Chitarra. *Siracusa:* Tip. Santoro, 1924. 101 pp. L. 6.

Cian, V. — La satira (fine del vol. I). *Milano:* F. Vallardi, 1924. Pp. xix + 289-524. L. 15. (Storia dei generi letterari italiani, fasc. 136.)

De Sanctis, F.—Saggi critici, a cura di G. Lazzeri. Vol. I. *Milano:* Casa ed. Sonzogno, 1923. 299 pp. L. 3.50. (Biblioteca classica economica, no. 140.)

De Stefano, F.—Chiosa dantesca sul canto XII del Paradiso. *Noto:* Tip. Zammit, 1923. 23 pp.

Del Valle de Paz, Ida.—Sulle origini e lo svolgimento del teatro religioso in Italia. *Udine:* Stab. tip. Friulano, 1924. 32 pp. L. 3.

Della Torre, R.—Da Virgilio a s. Paolo: briciole dantesche. (Il passo della fiumana e il passo dello Stige. Lo schermo della "Vita nova" nel Poema. Verso il commento novo.) *Cividale del Friuli:* Tip. G. Fulvio, 1924. 43 pp.

Di Casamichela, G.—Dante e lo studio dell'italiana favella. *Torino:* Tip. E. Arduini, 1924. 15 pp.

Di Francia, L.—Novellistica (fine del vol. I). *Milano:* F. Vallardi, 1924. Pp. viii + 385-732. L. 18. (Storia dei generi letterari italiani, fasc. 135.)

Fatini, G.—Su la fortuna e l'autenticità delle liriche di Ludovico Ariosto. *Torino:* Casa ed. G. Chiantore, 1924. 164 pp. L. 25. (Supplemento no. 23 del "Giornale storico della letteratura italiana.")

Fuà-Fusinato, Erminia.—Versi, con cenni biografici di P. G. Molmenti. *Spoleto:* Tip. Panetto e Petrelli, 1924. xv + 328 pp.

Fucci, C.—Alessandro Manzoni: trilogia. *Salerno:* Tip. Italo-americana, di R. Beraglia, 1923. 16 pp. (Bibliotechina scientifico-letteraria diretta da D. Romagnano.)

Marini, Emilia Bianca.—Il Tommaseo romanziere. *Ancona:* Stab. tip. del Commercio, 1923. 104 pp. L. 6.50.

Meda, F.—Lungo la via. Scritti storico-letterari. *Milano:* R. Ghirlanda (Bertarelli), 1924. 218 pp.

Mistruzzi, V.—Giovanni Cotta. *Torino:* Casa ed. G. Chiantore, 1922. 131 pp. L. 25. (Supplemento no. 22 del "Giornale storico della letteratura italiana.")

Papini, G.—Antologia della poesia religiosa italiana, a cura di —. *Milano:* Soc. ed. "Vita e pensiero," 1923. xxii + 398 pp. L. 15. (Il pensiero italiano, no. 6.)

Praga, M.—Cronache teatrali: 1923. *Milano:* Fratelli Treves, 1924. 282 pp. L. 9.

Rispoli, G.—Le tragedie del Gravina e Cola Capasso. *Napoli:* "Nuova Cultura" (S. Graziano e figlio), 1923. 29 pp.

Stoppani, A., e Fabris, C.—I primi e gli ultimi anni di Alessandro Manzoni. *Milano:* L. F. Cogliati, 1923. 214 pp. L. 8.50. (I. I primi anni di A. Manzoni: spigolature di A. Stoppani. II. Memorie manzoniane, di C. Fabris.)

Tonelli, L.—Il teatro italiano dalle origini ai giorni nostri. *Milano:* Modernissima, 1924. 426 pp. L. 22.

Tortoreto, A.—Poeti italiani del rinascimento e dell'età moderna. *Milano:* A. Vallardi, 1924. 120 pp. L. 2.50. (Biblioteca popolare di coltura Antonio Vallardi, no. 102.)

Zappa, Dina.—I misteri della Divina Commedia. (La selva e il colle. Il Veltro. La Pia senese.) *Milano:* Unione tip., 1924. 57 pp.

SPANISH

Alonso Cortés, N.—Índice de documentos útiles a la biografía. *Santander:* J. Martínez, 1922. 65 pp. (Boletín de la Biblioteca Menéndez Pelayo.)

Brenes Mesen, R.—Las categorías literarias. Cuadernos de pedagogía y otros estudios. *San José de Costa Rica, C. A.:* J. García Monge, 1924. 87 pp.

Diez y Carbonell, A.—Teoría elemental de la Literatura. *Madrid:* Tip. de la "Revista de Archivos," 1923. 304 pp.

Espinosa, A. M. — Elementary Spanish Conversation and Composition. *Boston:* Allyn and Bacon, 1924. xvii + 138 pp. $1.40.

Galland, J. S., and Brenes-Mesén, R. — Spanish Grammar Review. *Boston:* Allyn and Bacon, 1924. vii + 170 pp. $1.20.

Gaselee, S.—An Unrecorded Spanish Incunable. *London:* Oxford University Press, 1923. 3 pp. (From The Transactions of the Bibliographical Society.)

Hendrix, W. S. — Some Native Comic Types in the Early Spanish Drama. *Columbus, Ohio:* The Ohio State University, 1924. 115 pp. (The Ohio State University Bulletin, I, no. 3. Contributions in Languages and Literatures, no. 1.)

Henry, Ruth L.—Piececitas españolas fáciles. By —. *Boston:* Allyn and Bacon, 1924. vi + 105 pp. $0.80.

Marcos, B.—Los grandes filósofos españoles: San Ignacio de Loyola. *Madrid:* 1923. 370 pp.

Melsheimer, F., und Günther, A.—Lehrbuch des Spanischen. Grammatik. *Leipzig:* Quelle und Meyer, 1923. vii + 129 pp.

Montoto González de la Hoyuela, J.—Biblioteca provincial de Cádiz. Inventario. II. *Cádiz:* Talls. Salesianos, 1922. 116 pp.

Olmsted, E. W., and Sirich, E. H.—First Spanish Reader. Edited with notes, vocabulary, and exercises, by —. *New York:* Henry Holt and Co., 1924. viii + 258 pp.

Paz y Melia, A.—Series de los más importantes documentos del Archivo y Biblioteca del Excmo. Sr. Duque de Medinaceli. Elegidos y publicados a sus expensas, por —. Segunda serie: Bibliográfica. *Madrid:* Blass, 1922. 563 pp.

Redonet, L.—Escarceos y brochazos. Primera serie: Clérigos y damas. Intimidades y recato. Un paseo por el campo. *Madrid:* Sobrinos de la Suc. de M. Minuesa de los Ríos, 1922. 340 pp.

Refranes famosíssimos y provechosos glosados. *Madrid:* 1922. 18 pp.

Rickard, J. D.—Correrías por España. Fragmentos de las impresiones de un hispanófilo. *Madrid:* Imp. Cervantina, 1922. 138 pp.

Sánchez Alonso, B.—Crónica del obispo Don Pelayo. Edición preparada por —. *Madrid:* Sucesores de Hernando, 1924. 93 pp. 5 pes. (Junta para ampliación de estudios e investigaciones científicas. Centro de estudios históricos.)

Spitzer, L.—Ueber Ausbildung von Gegensinn in der Wortbildung. I: Die epizönen Nomina auf *-a(s)* in den iberischen Sprachen. II: Das Suffix *-one* im Romanischen. *Genève:* L. S. Olschki, 1921. lxxxi + 23[illegible] pp. (Biblioteca dell' "Archivum Romanicum," serie II, vol. II.)

Sturgis, C.—English to Spanish. *Columbus, Ohio:* R. G. Adams and Co., 1924. vi + 81 pp.

Vega, Lope de. — Il miglior giudice è il re. Tradotto e illustrato, a cura di A. Monteverdi. *Firenze:* Tip. L'Arte della stampa, 1922. xxxvi + 246 pp. L. 6.50.

Viñas Mey, C.—Una página para la historia del helenismo en España. *Madrid:* Imp. de la "Revista de Archivos," 1922. 86 pp.

GENERAL

Boillot, Felix.—The Methodical Study of Literature. *Paris:* Les Presses Universitaires, 1924. Fr. 12.

Bally, Gustav. — Psychologische Phänomene im Bedeutungswandel [Sprache und Dichtung, H. 30]. *Bern:* P. Haupt, 1924. 85 pp. M. 2.80.

Chamberlain, B. H.—A Simplified Grammar of the Japanese Language. Rev. ed. by J. G. McIlroy. *Chicago:* Univ. of Chicago Press [1924]. viii + 144 pp. $2.00.

Festschrift. Eugen Mogk zum 70. Geburtstag 19. Juli 1924. Mit 1 Portr. u. 2 Taf. *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1924. lii + 652 pp. M. 28.

Forchhammer, Jörgen. — Die Grundlage der Phonetik. Ein Versuch, die phonetische Wissenschaft auf fester sprachphysiologischer Grundlage aufzubauen. [Indogerm. Bibliothek, 3. Abt. 6.] *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1924. viii + 212 pp. M. 6.

Jespersen, Otto.—The Philosophy of Grammar. *New York:* Holt & Co., 1924. 359 pp.

Magonigle, H. V.—The Nature, Practice and History of Art. *New York:* Charles Scribner's Sons [1924]. xx + 319 pp. $2.00.

Norris, Herbert.—Costume and Fashion. Their evolution in Europe from the earliest time to the Norman Conquest. *London:* J. M. Dent and Sons, 1924. Crown 4to, 25s.

Ordbog over det Danske Sprog, grundlagt av Verner Dahlerup, udgivet af det Danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab. Femte. Sjette Bind. *København:* Gyldendalske Boghandel, 1923, 1924. 1312, 1248 pp.

Rank, Otto.—Die Don Juan-Gestalt. [S.-A. aus Imago, Bd. 8, 1922]. *Wien:* Internat. Psychoanal. Verlag, 1924. 83 pp. Bound, M. 3.50.

Slavonic. — Transliteration of Slavonic. Abridged from the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. VIII. *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press [1924]. 4 pp. 20 cts.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Aldington, Richard. — Literary Studies and Reviews. *London:* Allen and Unwin, 1924. 253 pp. 7s. 6d.

Beresford, John. — Gossip of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. *New York:* Alfred Knopf, 1924. $2.75.

—— The Diary of a Country Parson: The Reverend James Woodforde. 1758-1781. *Oxford:* The University Press, 1924. 376 pp. 12s. 6d.

Blackie, E. M.—The Pilgrimage of Robert Langton. Transcribed with an Introduction and Notes. *Cambridge:* Harvard University Press, 1924. xxv, 48 pp.

Brock, H. M.—Oliver Wendell Holmes: The Breakfast Table Series. *London:* Dent and Sons, 1924. 8vo. 5s.

Chambers, E. K.—Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association. Vol. X. *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press, 1924. 144 pp. $2.50.

—— The Disintegration of Shakespeare. A reconsideration of the Shakespeare Canon. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924. 22 pp.

Cox, John H.—Folk-Songs of the South. Collected under the auspices of the West Virginia Folk-Lore Society. *Cambridge:* Harvard Univ. Press, 1925. xxxi + 545 pp.

Dobrée, Bonamy.—Restoration Comedy, 1660-1720. *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press, 1924. 182 pp. $2.00.

Ehlers, Hans.—Farbige Worte im England der Kriegszeit. Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklungsgeschichte von Schlagwörtern, geflügelten Worten, u. a. Dissertation. *Greifswald:* 1924. 31 pp.

Fort, J. A.—The two Dated Sonnets of Shakespeare. *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press, 1924. 47 pp. $1.00.

Goulding, Sybil.—Swift en France. [Bibliothèque de la revue de littérature comparée, t. xv]. *Paris:* Champion, 1924, 210 pp.

Hamlet.—The Story of Hamlet and Horatio. [The Bacon-Shakespeare controversy.] *London:* Selwyn and Blount, 1924. 690 pp. 24s.

Hibbard, Laura A.—Mediaeval Romance in England. A Study of the Non-Cyclic Metrical Romances. *Oxford:* The University Press, 1924. $3.50.

Knight, G. C.—Superlatives. The outstanding characters of English and American fiction. *New York:* Alfred A. Knopf, 1924.

Langdon, Ida.—Milton's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art. *New Haven:* Yale University Press, 1924. 342 pp.

Masefield, John.—Shakespeare and Spiritual Life. The Romanes Lecture 1924. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924. 32 pp.

Moffatt, James.—The Bible in Scots Literature. *London:* Hodder and Stoughton, 1924. 294 pp. 10s. 6d.

Mutschmann, H.—Milton's Eyesight and the Chronology of His Works. *Dorpat:* Univ. of Dorpat, 1924. 50 pp.

Newman, Frances. — The Short Story's Mutations. *New York:* Huebsch, 1924. $2.50.

Pater.—The Works of Walter Pater. New Edition in ten volumes. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1924. Cloth $1.40.

Speare, Morris Edmund. — The Political Novel. *Oxford:* The University Press, 1924. 10s. 6d.

Steuart, John A.—Robert Louis Stevenson. 2 volumes. *Boston:* Little, Brown, and Co., 1924. $8.00.

Thomas, Calvin.—Scholarship and Other Essays. *New York:* Henry Holt & Co., 1924. 217 pp. $2.00.

Wildhagen, K.—Die treibenden Kräfte im englischen Bildungswesen. [Manns Pädagogisches Magazin, H. 947.] *Langensalza:* Beyer, 1924. M. 1.50.

Wilstach, Frank J.—A Dictionary of Similes. Revised and enlarged. *Boston:* Little, Brown and Co., 1924. $4.00.

Wright, Joseph and Elizabeth Mary.—An Elementary Historical English Grammar. *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press, 1924. 224 pp. $2.35.

GERMAN

Aron, Erich. — Hölderlin der ewige und der deutsche Jüngling. *München:* Hain-Verlag, 1924. 81 pp. 4°. Bound, M. 4.

Bach, Adolf.—Aus dem Kreise der Sophie La Roche. [Saaleck-Bücher, 11.] *Köln:* Saaleck-Verlag, 1924. 177 pp. M. 2.—.

Bostock, J. K.—Albertanus Brixiensis in Germany, Being an account of the MHG translations from his didactic treatises. *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press, 1924. 123 pp. $1.70.

Claes, S. B.—Erzählungstechnik in Roseggers: "Buch der Novellen." *Münster:* Regensbergsche Buchh., 1924. 50 pp. M. 2.

Euripides.—Alkestis, verdeutscht, erl. u. f. d. Bühne eingerichtet von Adolf Trendelenburg. Mit e. Anh. über Wielands Alceste und Goethes Götter, Helden und Wieland. *Berlin:* W. Grützmacher, 1924. 89 pp. Bound, M. 2.25.

v

Füller, Franziska. — Das psychologische Problem der Frau in Kleists Dramen und Novellen. *Leipzig:* H. Haessel, 1924. 96 pp. M. 2.20.

Goethe. — Publications of the English Goethe Society. New Series, Vol. I. Papers read before the Society 1923-1924. Ed. by J. G. Robertson. *London:* Alexander Moring, 1924. 106 pp.

Hirschberg, Leopold. — Der Taschengoedeke. *Berlin:* Tiedemann & Uzielli, 1924. vi + 815 pp. Cloth, M. 40.

Hufschmid, Maximilian.—Goethes Heidelberger Freundin Helene Dorothea Delph und ihre Angehörigen (S.-A. aus Neues Archiv f. d. Geschichte d. Stadt Heidelberg. Bd. 11]. *Heidelberg:* G. Koester, 1924. 52 pp. M. 1.

Judith. Ein mitteldeutsches Gedicht aus d. 13. Jh. Aus d. Stuttgarter Hs. zum ersten Mal hrsg. v. Rud. Palgen. [Altd. Textbibl. Nr. 18.]. *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1924. vii + 89 pp. M. 2.80.

Köster, Albert, u. Julius Petersen.—Geschichte der deutschen Literatur. Erster Band: Heldendichtung, Geistlichendichtung, Ritterdichtung von Hermann Schneider. *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1925. xvi + 532 pp. M. 20.

Konrad von Helmsdorf.—Der Spiegel des menschlichen Heils, aus d. St. Galler Hs. hrsg. v. Axel Lindquist [Deu. Texte des Mittelalters, Bd. 31.] *Berlin:* Weidmann, 1924. xxviii + 118 pp. M. 9.

Leitzmann, Albert. — Fischartiana. Mit einem Anhang: Kaspar Scheits "Reformation der Musica." [Jenaer germ. Forsch. 6.] *Jena:* Frommann, 1924. v + 90 pp.

Lerber, Helene v.—Der Einfluss der französischen Sprache und Literatur auf Conrad Ferd. Meyer und seine Dichtung. [Sprache und Dichtung, H. 29]. *Bern:* P. Haupt, 1924. 171 pp. M. 4.80.

Neuburger, Paul.—Die Verseinlage in der Prosadichtung der Romantik mit einer Einl.: Zur Geschichte der Verseinlage. [Palaestra, 145]. *Leipzig:* Mayer & Müller, 1924. vii + 332 pp. M. 12.

Pamperrien, Rud.—Das Problem menschlicher Gemeinschaft in Richard Dehmels Werk. *Tübingen:* Mohr, 1924. iii + 103 pp. M. 3.50.

Robertson, J. G.—The Gods of Greece in German Poetry. The Taylorian Lecture 1924. *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press, 1924. 32 pp. 70 cts.

Rooth, Erik.—Studien zu den altniederfränkischen und altwestfälischen Psalterversionen [Uppsala Univ. Årsskrift. Filosofi, språkvetenskap och hist. vetenskaper. S. 1924]. *Uppsala:* Lundequist [1924]. v + 96 pp. Kr. 3.50.

Rost, Bernh. — Entstehung und erste Aufführung von Ludwig Ganghofers "Der Herrgottschnitzer von Ammergau." Mit einem kurzen Lebensabrisse u. e. Verz. d. dramat. Arbeiten d. Dichters. *Chemnitz:* Verl. der "Bühne," 1924. 30 pp. 60 Pf.

Schinnerer, O. P.—Woman in the Life and Work of Gutzkow. *New York:* Columbia Univ. Press, 1924. xi + 127 pp. $2.00.

Sievers, Ed.—Deutsche Sagversdichtungen des IX.-XI. Jahrhunderts, nebst einem Anhang: Die gotische Bergpredigt [Germanische Handbibliothek, II. Abt.: Untersuchungen u. Texte, 16.]. *Heidelberg:* Winter, 1924. vi + 174 pp. M. 5.

Sommer, Paul.—Erläuterungen zu Jos. Viktor von Scheffels "Ekkehard." *Leipzig:* Herm. Beyer [1924]. 100 pp. M. 0.80.

Stecher, G.—Cäsar Flaischlen. Kunst und Leben. *Stuttgart:* Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1924. x + 224 pp. M. 3.50.

Vogel, Julius.—Goethe in Venedig. Mit 16 Tafeln. 3. Aufl. *Leipzig:* Klinkhardt & Biermann, 1924. xii + 172 pp. Bound M. 5.20.

Weitbrecht, Marie.—Eduard Mörike. Bilder aus s. Cleversulzbacher Pfarrhaus. *Stuttgart:* Fleischhauer & Spohn [1924]. 47 pp. M. 3.

Winterholer, Hans. — Eltern und Kinder in der deutschen Literatur des 18. Jhs. [Giessener Beiträge, 11.]. *Giessen:* v. Münchow, 1924. 112 pp. M. 2.

FRENCH

Andison, J. Gordon. — The Affirmative Particles in French. University of Toronto Press, 1924. 103 pp.

Axelsen, A.—Supernatural Beings in the French Mediaeval Dramas. *Copenhagen:* Levin og Munksgard, 1924.

Behrens, Dietrich. — Ueber deutsches Sprachgut im Französischen. *Giessen:* Roman. Seminar d. Universit., 1924. 104 pp. 4°. Gm. 3. (Giessener Beiträge zur roman. Philologie. Zusatzh. 1.)

Camerlynck, Mme and G. H. — France. Deuxième Année de Français. *New York:* Allyn and Bacon, 1924. iv + 256 pp. $1.25.

Desnoyers, L.—Les Aventures de Robert-Robert. Ed. by A. Truan. *Oxford:* The Clarendon Press, 1924. 96 pp. 50 cts.

Glaser, Kurt.—Frankreich und seine Einrichtungen. *Bielefeld und Leipzig:* Velhagen & Klasing, 1923. (Die Hausbibliothek des Philologen.)

Glossaire des Patois de la Suisse Romande. Vingt-cinquième rapport annuel de la rédaction 1923. *Neuchatel:* Impr. Paul Attinger. 8 pp.

Guibert d'Andrenas. — Chanson de geste. Ed. by Jessie Crosland. *Manchester:* University Press, 1924. 4/6.

Horton, C. T.—French Idioms and Phrases. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924. 35 pp. 35 cts.

Hue de Rotelande.—Protheselaus, ein altfrz. Abenteuerroman . . . , hrsg. von Franz Kluckow. Band I. (Gesellschaft f. rom. Literatur. Band 45). *Göttingen:* 1924. (Halle, Niemeyer). 490 pp. M. 25.

Kredel, Elisabeth.—Studien zur Geschichte des Wortspiels im Französischen. *Giessen:* Roman. Seminar, 1923. 134 pp. 4°. Gm. 4.50. (Giessener Beiträge zur roman. Philologie, 13.)

Kurz, H.—Lectures pour tous. *New York:* The Century Co., 1924. xi + 248 pp. $1.25.

Labiche et Delacour.—Les petits Oiseaux. *New York:* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924. xix + 175 pp. 88 cts.

Marguerite de Navarre.—Oeuvres. Hrsg. E. Schneegans. *Strassburg:* Heitz. 1924. M. 3.40. (Bibliotheca Romanica, 295-299, Bibliothèque française.)

Molen, W. van der.—Le subjonctif. Sa valeur psychologique et son emploi dans la langue parlée. *Amsterdam:* Zalt Bommel, van der Garde et Co., 1924.

Morawski, J. — Le Facet en François. Edition critique des cinq traductions des deux Facetus latins avec introduction, notes et glossaire. *Poznań:* 1923. xlviii + 131 pp. (Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk. Prace Komisji Filologiczne, II, 1.)

Pargment, M. S.—Le Français Oral. *New York:* Heath, 1924. viii + 322 pp.

Payen-Payne, de V. and Clarke, T. H.—French Poems of Today, an Anthology. *London:* Sidgwick and Jackson, 1924. xvi + 240 pp. 5/- net (school ed. 3/6).

Sand, G.—La Mare au Diable, ed. by L. and A. Cardon. *New York:* Allyn and Bacon, 1924. x + 214 pp. 80 cts.

Sardou, V.—La Perle noire, ed. by K. McKenzie. *New York:* The Century Co., 1924. xi + 139 pp. 90 cts.

Schopbach, Irene. — Deutschland und die Deutschen im Urteil Honoré de Balzacs.—Alfred de Musset in seinem dramatischen Werk von Wilhelm Geyer. *Giessen:* Roman. Seminar, 1923. ii + 53 pp. 4°. Gm. 1.50. (Giessener Beiträge zur roman. Philologie, 12.)

Sells, Arthur Lytton.—Les Sources françaises de Goldsmith [Bibliothèque de la revue de littérature comparée, t. XII.] *Paris:* Champion, 1924. 233 pp.

Stauber, Eug. — Guy de Maupassant. *Zurich:* Selbstverlag des Verfassers, 1924. 133 pp. 8°.

Studer, Paul and E. G. R. Waters.—Historical French Reader. Medieval Period. *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press, 1924. xii + 469 pp. $7.00.

Thomov, Thomas S.—Victor Hugo et le moyen âge. Contribution à l'étude du moyen âge dans la langue et le style de Victor Hugo. *Sofia:* Impr. de la cour, 1924. 82 pp.

ITALIAN

Albanesi, Anna.—Enrico Nencioni. *Bologna-Rocca S. Casciano:* L. Cappelli, 1923. 164 pp. L. 6.

Alfieri, Vittorio.—Le tragedie. *Sancasciano-Pesa:* Soc. ed. Toscana (fratelli Stianti), 1923. ix + 507 pp. L. 5. (Biblioteca classica popolare, no. 2.)

Alighieri, Dante.—La Divina Commedia, commentata da V. Rossi. I: l'Inferno. *Napoli:* Soc. ed. F. Perrella, 1923. viii + 458 pp. L. 12. (Biblioteca classica italiana.)

—— Il Fiore e il Detto d'amore attribuiti a —. Testo del secolo XIII, con introduzione di G. Mazzoni. *Firenze:* Fratelli Alinari, 1923. 10 pp. and 66 facsimiles.

Allodoli, E.—Vecchi e novi, forestieri e nostrali. *Palermo:* R. Sandron, 1923. 208 pp. L. 8. (Biblioteca Sandron di scienze e lettere, no. 89.)

Angelini, C.—Il dono del Manzoni. *Firenze:* Vallecchi, 1924. 94 pp. L. 5. (Uomini e idee, a cura di E. Codignola.)

Carraroli, D.—Prontuario dantesco. Dizionario delle persone, dei luoghi e delle cose contenuti nella "Divina Commedia," con annotazioni e commenti. *Milano:* Casa ed. Sonzogno, 1923. 124 pp. L. 1.40. (Biblioteca del popolo, ni. 643-644.)

Cesini, G. — Il romanzo cremonese di Brocchi. Appunti critici. *Casale Monf.:* Tip. Bellatore, Bosco e C., 1923. 44 pp. L. 4.

Cognetti Astràs, Luigia.—Le figure femminili nell' arte di A. Manzoni. Conferenza. *Messina:* Tip. Guerriera, 1924. 23 pp.

De Sanctis, F.—Saggi critici, a cura di G. Lazzeri. Vol. III. *Milano:* Casa ed. Sonzogno, 1923. 349 pp. L. 3.50. (Biblioteca classica economica, no. 142.)

D'Onofrio, A. — Pei sentieri fioriti della poesia. Spigolature mariane. *Aquila:* Tip. Vecchioni, 1924. 78 pp.

Ferrari, V.—Il canto XXIX del Paradiso, letto nella sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. *Firenze:* G. C. Sansoni, 1923. 35 pp. L. 3. (Lectura Dantis.)

Ferrero, G. G.—La poesia carducciana ed altri saggi. *Roma:* A. Signorelli, 1924. 49 pp.

Fusco, Maria.—I poemetti latini di Giovanni Pascoli. Studio critico. *Catania:* N. Giannotta, 1924. 254 pp. L. 12.

Manzoni, Alessandro.—Liriche, tragedie e versi vari, per cura di G. Lesca. *Firenze:* G. Barbèra, 1923. 531 pp.

—— Numero-ricordo del "Resegone," per il cinquantesimo della morte ed il 1° centenario dei "Promessi Sposi" (22 maggio 1923). *Lecco:* Tip. del "Resegone," 1923. 32 pp. L. 5.

Musella, V. — Dante e la sua trilogia. Prefazione di G. Di Martino. *Roma:* Albrighi, Segati e C., 1923. viii + 135 pp. L. 10.

Ortiz, R.—Leopardi e la Spagna. Appunti. *Bucuresti:* Cultura Natională, 1923. 56 pp. (Academia Română, Memoriile Secțiunii Literare, Seria III, Tomul I, Mem. 4.)

Pellizzari, A.—Il Quadrivio nel Rinascimento. *Napoli:* Soc. ed. F. Perrella, 1924. 93 pp. L. 15. (Biblioteca della "Rassegna," VIII.)

Venturi, G. A. — Da Dante al Manzoni. Studî critici offerti a — nella sua giubilazione, 1888-1922. *Pavia:* Tip. succ. Fusi, 1923. 264 pp.

Zanella, G.—Poesie, con prefazione di Arturo Graf. Nuova edizione riveduta, con i sonetti dell' "Astichello," diciassette dei quali inediti. *Firenze:* F. Le Monnier, 1923. 2 vols., lxxxii + 283, 418 pp. L. 10.

SPANISH

Cabal, C.—Los cuentos tradicionales asturianos. *Madrid:* Edit. "Voluntad," 1924. 254 pp. 4 pes.

Cervantes.—Rinconete y Cortadillo. Mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen herausgegeben von M. L. Wagner. *Leipzig:* B. G. Teubner, 1924. 32 pp. (Teubners spanische und hispanoamerikanische Textausgaben, 2.)

—— The History of Don Quixote of the Mancha. Translated from the Spanish by Th. Shelton. Reprinted from the first edition, 1612-1620. With a new preface by F. J. Harvey Daton. *London:* Narvare Society, 1923. £ 3.35.

Fernán Caballero. — Páginas escogidas. Mit Einleitung, Anmerkungen und Wörterbuch herausgegeben von B. Marwedel. *Leipzig:* B. G. Teubner, 1924. 40 pp. (Teubners spanische und hispanoamerikanische Textausgaben, 4.)

Gaselee, S.—The Spanish Books in the Library of Samuel Pepys. *Oxford:* University Press, 1921. 49 pp. (Supplement to the Bibliographical Society's Transactions, n. 2.)

González Moreno, J. — Tratado elemental de etimología greco-latina-castellana. *México:* "La Nación," 1921. 544 pp.

Heinermann, T. — Geschichte der spanischen Literatur. *Kempten:* J. Kösel und F. Pustet, 1923. 131 pp. (Sammlung Kösel.

Krüger, F.—El dialecto de San Ciprián de Sanabria. Monografía leonesa. *Madrid.* Sucesores de Hernando, 1923. 132 pp. 12 pes. ("Revista de Filología Española," Anejo IV.)

Latino, A.—La nueva literatura. *Barcelona:* Núñez y Ca., 1922. 226 pp. 2.50 pes.

Ortiz, F. — Un catauro de cubanismos. Apuntes lexicográficos. *Habana:* 1923. viii + 270 pp.

Pérez Galdós, B.—La loca de la casa. Comedia en cuatro actos. Edited with introduction, notes, exercises, and vocabulary, by J. Warshaw. *New York:* Henry Holt and Co., 1924. xxxvi + 300 pp.

Sagredo, J. J.—Bibliografía dominicana de la provincia bética (1515-1921). *Almagro:* Tip. del Rosario, 1922. vi + 196 pp.

Solveta-Dima, P.—Ensayo de la unificación de dialectos baskos. *Buenos Aires:* Tip. "La Baskonia," 1922. 180 pp.

Torre y del Cerro, J. de la.—La familia de Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra. Apuntes genealógicos y biográficos, fundamentados en documentos cordobeses. *Córdoba:* Imp. "La Comercial," 1923. iv + 106 pp.

GENERAL

Adams, Henry F.—The Ways of the Mind. The Study and Use of Psychology. *New York:* Scribner, 1925. viii + 336 pp. $1.80.

Ernst, Fritz.—Der Klassizismus in Italien, Frankreich und Deutschland. *Wien:* Amalthea-Verlag, 1924. 153 pp. 8°. Kr. 25,000; Hlwbd. Kr. 35,000.

Litteris. — An International Critical Review of the Humanities. Published by the New Society of Letters at Lund under the editorship of S. B. Liljegren, Jöran Sahlgren, Lauritz Weibull. Vol. 1, No. 1, Sept. 1924. *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press, 1924. 96 pp. $1.20.

Meillet, A. et Marcel Cohen.—Les Langues du Monde par un groupe de linguistes sous la direction de —. [Collection Linguistique, XVI]. *Paris:* Champion, 1924. 811 pp., 18 pl.

Robinson, David M.—Sappho and her Influence. [Our Debt to Greece and Rome]. *Boston:* Marshall Jones Co., 1924. xii + 272 pp., with plates.

Trombetti, A. — Elementi di glottologia. *Bologna:* Zanichelli, 1924. v + 755 pp. L. 80.

Voigt, Max.—Beiträge zur Geschichte der Visionenliteratur im Mittelalter. [Palaestra, 146]. *Leipzig:* Mayer & Müller, 1924. viii + 245 pp. M. 10.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Borrow, George.—Selections, with Essays by Richard Ford, Leslie Stephen, and George Saintsbury. With an Introduction and Notes by Humphrey S. Milford. [Clarendon English Series.] *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924. 224 pp.

Clements, Colin C.—Plays and Pagans. *New York:* Appleton, 1924. $1.75.

De Maar, Harko G.—A History of Modern English Romanticism. Vol. I. Elizabethan and Modern Romanticism in the Eighteenth Century. *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press, 1924. 246 pp. $3.50.

Frost, Minnie E. and Secor, Mary L.—Correct English Through Practice. *New York:* Scribners, 1924.

Gosse, Edmund.—Essays by Divers Hands. Being the Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature of the United Kingdom. New Series, Volume IV. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924. 156 pp.

Gingerich, S. F.—Essays on the Romantic Poets. *New York:* Macmillan, 1924. $2.25.

Griston, Harris J.—Shaking the Dust from Shakespeare. An Authentic Renovation of the Merchant of Venice. Second Ed. *New York:* Cosmopolis Press, 1924. xxxiv + 342 pp. $3.00.

Howard, Claud. — Coleridge's Idealism. A Study of its Relationship to Kant and to the Cambridge Platonists. *Boston:* Richard G. Badger [1924], 108 pp.

Kellett, E. E.—Suggestions: Literary Essays. *Cambridge:* Cambridge Univ. Press, 1924. 7s. 6d.

Lee, Sir Sidney, and F. S. Boas.—The Year's Work in English Studies, Vol. IV, 1923. Edited for the English Association. *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press, 1924, 269 pp. $2.50.

Masefield, John.—Recent Prose. *London:* Heinemann, 1924. 207 pp. 6s.

Morley, F. V.—Dora Wordsworth, Her Book. *London:* Selwyn Blount, 1924. 7s. 6d.

Murry, John M.—Discoveries: Essays in Literary Criticism. *London:* Collins, 1924. 314 pp. 7s. 6d.

Robertson, J. M.—An Introduction to the Study of the Shakespeare Canon. *London:* Routledge, 1924. 494 pp. 25s.

Saintsbury, George.—A Last Scrap Book. *London:* Macmillan, 1924. 7s. 6d.

Sarolea, Charles.—Robert Louis Stevenson and France. *London:* Simpkin, Marshall, 1924. 3s. 6d.

Small, George William.—The Comparison of Inequality. The Semantics and Syntax of the Comparative Particle in English. *Baltimore:* The Johns Hopkins Univ., 1924. x + 174 pp.

Stevenson.—Robert Louis Stevenson: His Work and His Personality. [A *Bookman Library* Volume of Essays.] *London:* Hodder and Stoughton, 1924. 251 pp. 7s. 6d.

Sykes, H. Dugdale.—Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama. A series of studies dealing with the authorship of Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Plays. *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press, 1924. 231 pp. $4.20.

Symons, Arthur.—Leigh Hunt: Essays. Edited with introduction. *London:* Dent and Sons, 1924. 5s.

Tinker, C. B.—Letters of James Boswell, collected and edited. 2 vols. *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press, 1924. xxii + 270; xi + 550 pp. $10.00.

Tucker, T. G.—The Sonnets of Shakespeare. Edited from the Quarto of 1609, with Introduction and Commentary. *Cambridge:* Cambridge Univ. Press, 1924. 239 pp. 17s. 6d.

Ward, Alfred C.—Aspects of the Modern Short Story. *London:* University of London Press, 1924.

Weekley, Ernest.—A concise Etymological Dictionary of Modern English. *New York:* E. P. Dutton & Co. [1924]. xx + 983 pp. $3.00.

Wilkinson, Marguerite.—The Way of the Makers. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1924.

Yeats, W. B.—Plays in Prose and Verse. *New York:* Macmillan, 1924. 455 pp. $5.00.

—— Plays and Controversies. *New York:* Macmillan, 1924. 474 pp. $2.50.

—— Later Poems. *New York:* Macmillan, 1924. 363 pp. $5.00.

GERMAN

Badstüber, Hubert.—Die deutsche Fabel von ihren ersten Anfängen bis auf die Gegenwart. *Wien:* Gerold, 1924. viii + 48 pp. M. 1.70.

Burdach, Konrad.—Die nationale Aneignung der Bibel und die Anfänge der germ. Philologie. [S.-A. aus Festschrift Eugen Mogk]. *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1924. vii + 131 pp. M. 6.

Collitz, H.—Wodan, Hermes und Puschan. [Repr. fr. Festskrift Hugo Pipping]. *Helsingfors:* 1924. Pp. 574-587.

Drahn, Hermann.—Das Werk Stefan Georges. Seine Religiosität u. s. Ethos. *Leipzig:* F. Hirt & Sohn, 1925. x + 160 pp. Bound, M. 5.

Elster, Ernst.—Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock. Rede. *Marburg a. L.:* Elwert, 1924. 30 pp. M. 1.20.

Everth, Erich.—Conrad Ferdinand Meyer. Dichtung und Persönlichkeit. *Dresden:* Sibyllen-Verlag, 1924. 363 pp., cloth, M. 8.

Fischer, Hans W.—Arno Holz. Eine Einführung in sein Werk. *Berlin:* J. H. W. Dietz [1924]. 166 pp., M. 14.

Greyerz, Otto v.—Die Mundartdichtung der deutschen Schweiz geschichtlich dargestellt [Die Schweiz im deu. Geistesleben, 33.] *Leipzig:* H. Haessel, 1924. 117 pp. Boards, M. 2.

Grillparzer, F.—Sämtliche Werke. Hist.-krit. Ausg. Hrsg. v. A. Sauer. Abt. 2, Bd. 4, 6, 11. Abt. 3, Bd. 2. *Wien:* Schroll & Co. [1924]. M. 8. per vol.

Gundolf, Friedr. — Hutten. Klopstock. Arndt. 3 Reden. *Heidelberg:* Weiss'sche Univ. Bh. 1924. 70 pp. M. 2.

Haas, A. de. — Fritz Reuters religiöse Weltanschauung. Eine Studie s. Lebens u. s. Werke. *Newied a. Rh.:* J. Meincke, 1924. 23 pp. 50 Pf.

Henz, Rudolf. — Die Landschaftsdarstellung bei Jean Paul. [Deutsche Kultur. Lit.-hist. Reihe. 1.] *Wien:* Österr. Schulbücherverlag, 1924. 190 pp. Kr. 52,000.

Hettner, Herm. — Das moderne Drama. Aesthetische Untersuchungen. Hrsg. v. P. A. Merbach. [Deu. Literaturdenkmale d. 18. u. 19. Jh. Nr. 151]. *Berlin:* B. Behr, 1924. viii + 185 pp. M. 4.50.

Kerber, Robert.—Hölderlins Verhältnis zu Homer [S.-A. aus Philologus, Bd. 80, H. 1]. *Leipzig:* Dieterich, 1924. 66 pp. M. 2.50.

Kluge, Friedrich.—Deutsche Sprachgeschichte. Werden u. Wachsen unserer Muttersprache von ihren Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. 2., durchges. Aufl. *Leipzig:* Quelle & Meyer, 1925. viii + 346 pp. M. 8.

Lang, Franz.—Platens Trimeter. Ein Beitr. zur antikisierenden Verstechnik. *Czernowitz:* F. Mühldorf, 1924. 23 pp. 50 Pf.

Lunz, Ludwig. — Die oberfränkischen Dichtungen und Dichter. Mit bes. Beachtung Bambergs. Ein Literaturbild. *Wunsiedel:* G. Kohler, 1924. 122 pp. M. 2.50.

Lenschau, Martha. — Grimmelshausens Sprichwörter und Redensarten [Deutsche Forschungen. H. 10]. *Frankfurt a. M.:* Diesterweg, 1924. iii + 155 pp. M. 6.60.

Pfannmüller, Gustav. — Goethe und das Kirchenlied. Ein Beitr. zum Streit um Goethes "Joseph." *Hamburg:* W. Gente, 1924. 99 pp. M. 2.

Rheinisches Wörterbuch. Bd. 1. Lfg. 3. Arnleiter-Backtag. *Bonn:* K. Schröder, 1924. Cols. 257-384. 4°. M. 2.

Seelig, Geert.—Klaus Groth. Sein Leben und Werden. *Hamburg:* Alster-Verlag, 1924. xv + 429 pp. Bound, M. 6.

Ullrich, Albert.—Wilhelm Meister als Schlüssel-Roman. [Das Goethe-Gelbbuch. Vorveröffentlichung 3]. *Hamburg:* C. Boysen, 1924. 141 pp. M. 5.

Wagner, Albert M.—Heinrich Wilhelm von Gerstenberg und der Sturm und Drang. 2. Bd. Gerstenberg als Typus der Übergangszeit. *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1924. xi + 373 pp.

Walter von der Vogelweide. Hrsg. u. erkl. v. W. Wilmanns. 4., vollst. umgearb. Aufl., bes. v. V. Michels, Bd. 2. [Germ. Handbibliothek, I, 2]. *Halle:* Waisenhaus, 1924. x + 553 pp. M. 18.

Walzel, Oskar.—Vom Geiste neuer Literaturforschung. Festschrift f. Oskar Walzel. Hrsg. v. Julius Wahle u. Victor Klemperer. *Wildpark-Potsdam:* Akad. Verl. Athenaion [1924]. 111 + 232 pp. M. 18.

Weise, Oskar.—Wanderungen auf dem Gebiete der deutschen Sprachgeschichte und Wortbedeutung. *Jena:* Frommann. 1925. viii + 111 pp. M. 2.80.

FRENCH

Chéron, Jeanne, and Schenck, E. M. — A Handbook of French Correspondence. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924. ix + 125 pp. 85 cts.

Cousins, C. E. and Ward, C. F.—Student's Handbook of French Pronunciation. *New York:* Holt, 1924. iv + 88 pp.

Curel, François de.—La Nouvelle Idole, ed. by H. A. Smith and L. R. Méras. *New York:* The Century Co., 1924. xvii + 124 pp. 85 cts.

Falshaw, Gladys.—Leconte de Lisle et l'Inde. Diss. *Paris:* H. d'Arthez, 1923. 232 pp.

Greenberg, Jacob.—Second French book. *New York:* Merrill, 1924. 310 pp. $1.20.

Haas, J. — Kurzgefasste frz. Literaturgeschichte von 1549-1900. I. Band: 1549-1650. *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1924. viii + 250 pp. M. 6.

—— Kurzgefasste neufrz. Syntax. Verkürzte Bearbeitung d. neufrz. Syntax (Sammlung Kurzer Lehrbücher . . . , hrsg. v. Karl Voretzsch, IV). *Halle:* Niemeyer. 1924. xii + 111 pp. M. 3.50, geb. M. 4.50.

Humpkins, C. H.—Favorite French poems. *New York:* Holt, 1924, 153 pp. 84 cts.

Jenkins, T. A.—La Chanson de Roland. Oxford Version. Edition, notes, gloss. *Boston:* Heath, 1924. cl + 378 pp.

Kettridge, J. O.—Fr.-Eng. and Eng.-Fr. dict. of terms used in finance. *New York:* Dutton, 1924. 256 pp. $4.

Macdonald, G. R.—Manual of Fr. commercial correspondence. *New York:* Pitman, 1924. 343 pp. $2.25.

Marie de France.—Die Lais, hrsg. von Karl Warnke, mit vergleichenden Anmerkungen v. Johannes Bolte u. einem Anhang 'der Lai von Guingamor' hrsg. v. Peter Kusel. Dritte verbesserte Auflage. *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1925. (Bibl. Normannica . . . , hrsg. von Walther Suchier, III). clxxxiv + 344 pp. M. 14.

May, T. L.—Anatole France, the man and his work. *New York:* Dodd, Mead, 1924. 273 pp. $3.

Partridge, E.—The French Romantics' Knowledge of English Literature (1820-1848). *Paris:* Champion, 1924. xv + 370 pp. Fr. 40.

Peoples, M. H. et Schinz, A.—La société des bonnes lettres (1821-1830); Dadaïsme (1916-1921). *Northampton:* Smith Coll., 1923. 89 pp.

Rostand, E.—Les romanesques, ed. by H. Le Daum. *Boston:* Ginn, 1924. 156 pp. 64 cts.

Schwartz, H. S.—An Outline History of French Literature. *New York:* Knopf, 1924. 173 pp.

Song of Roland, The, newly translated into English, with an Introduction, by Jessie Crosland. (Medieval Library, Vol. XXI). *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924. xxiii + 143 pp. $1.85.

Spring, H. S.—Chateaubriand at the crossways. *New York:* Columbia Press, 1924. 214 pp. $2.50.

ITALIAN

Alfieri, Vittorio.—Virginia. Tragedia in cinque atti, con prefazione di A. C. *Bologna-Rocca S. Casciano:* L. Cappelli, 1923. 59 pp. L. 1.

Alighieri, Dante.—La Divina Commedia. Traduzione in dialetto siciliano, del dott. F. Guastalla. *Palermo:* Tip. A. Di Carlo e C., 1923. v + 619 pp. L. 12.

Ambrosini, L.—Saverio Baldacchini: l'uomo e il patriotta, lo scrittore e il poeta. *Bari:* Soc. tip. Pugliese, 1924. viii + 107 pp. L. 10.

Berzero, G.—Contributo della città di Vercelli alla storia della cultura italiana. *Camerino:* Tip. succ. Savini-Mercuri, 1923. 51 pp.

Canni, Elisa.—Significato del comico e sue espressioni in "Pinocchio" del Collodi. *Cremona:* 1923. 55 pp.

Cazzamini Mussi, F.—Ritratti letterari. *Palermo:* R. Sandron, 1923. 254 pp. L. 10. (Biblioteca Sandron di scienze e lettere, no. 93.)

Cesareo, E.—Le traduzioni italiane delle monografie di Sallustio. *Palermo:* Scuola tip. Boccone del povero, 1924. 129 pp. L. 12.50.

Cesareo, G. A.—Le origini della poesia lirica e la poesia siciliana sotto gli Svevi. Seconda edizione accresciuta. *Palermo:* R. Sandron, 1924. x + 463 pp. L. 18. (Biblioteca Sandron di scienze e lettere, no. 95.)

Compagni, Dino, e Villani, Giovanni.—Le più belle pagine, scelte da I. Del Lungo. *Milano:* Fratelli Treves, 1924. xxi + 284 pp. (Le più belle pagine degli scrittori italiani scelti da scrittori viventi.)

Croce, Benedetto.—Saggi sulla letteratura italiana del seicento. Seconda edizione riveduta. *Bari:* G. Laterza e figli, 1924. xxiii + 416 pp. L. 30. (Scritti di storia letteraria e politica di B. Croce, I).

De Sanctis, F.—Saggi critici, a cura di G. Lazzeri. Vol. II. *Milano*: Casa ed. Sonzogno, 1923. 339 pp. L. 3.50. (Biblioteca classica economica, no. 141.)

Genoino, A.—Profilo del marchese di Caccavone, con versi rari ed inediti. *Napoli:* Casa tip. ed. N. Jovene e C., 1924. 194 pp. L. 9.

Gentile, G.—Dante e Manzoni, con un saggio su arte e religione. *Firenze:* Vallecchi, 1923. 172 pp. L. 8. (La critica letteraria, a cura di E. Codignola, III.)

Giusti, Giuseppe.—Poesie. *Firenze:* A. Salani, 1924. 422 pp. L. 5.75. (Collezione Salani: i classici. Edizione Florentia.)

—— Tutti gli scritti editi ed inediti, con introduzione, indici a cura di F. Martini. *Firenze:* G. Barbèra, 1924. xl + 608 pp. L. 40.

Leopardi, G.—Canti scelti, con introduzione e commento di F. Biondolillo. *Firenze:* Vallecchi, 1924. 114 pp. L. 5. (Classici italiani commentati.)

Maffi, P.—Conversazioni manzoniane col mio clero, luglio-dicembre 1923. *Torino:* Soc. ed. Internazionale, 1924. 109 pp. L. 3.50.

Maltese, G.—L'arte e il teatro nuovo. Saggio critico (Tilgher e Pirandello; Sei personaggi in cerca d'autore). *Messina:* Casa ed. La Sicilia, 1924. 64 pp. L. 3.50.

Martini, F. M.—Cronache drammatiche, 1922. *Roma:* Casa ed. "Rassegna internazionale," 1923. vii + 204 pp. L. 9.

Naselli, Carmelina.—Il Petrarca nell'ottocento. *Napoli:* Soc. ed. F. Perrella, 1924. viii + 571 pp. L. 60. (Biblioteca della "Rassegna," VIII.)

Olympo Alessandri da Sassoferrato, B.—Strambotti de laude tratti da la "Gloria d'amore," con un capitolo et una partenza, a cura di G. Vitaletti. *Fiorenza:* Tip. Giuntina, 1923. 9 pp. (Per nozze Olschki-Mosse.)

Santi, A.—L'ordinamento morale e l'allegoria della Divina Commedia. L'ordinamento morale. *Palermo:* R. Sandron, 1923. 320 pp. L. 16. (Biblioteca Sandron di scienze e lettere, no. 92.)

Sciortino, G.—L'epoca della critica. *Torino:* P. Gobetti, 1924. 40 pp. L. 3.

Tasso, Torquato.—La Gerusalemme Liberata, con le figure di Giambatista Piazzetta. In Venezia. MDCCXLV, stampata da Giambatista Albrizzi q. Girol. *Milano:* Fratelli Treves, 1924. xii + 513 pp. and 22 tables. L. 50.

Tommaseo, N.—Poesie. *Firenze:* F. Le Monnier, 1923. 643 pp. L. 5.

SPANISH

Bécquer, Gustavo Adolfo.—Páginas desconocidas. Recopiladas por F. Iglesias Figueroa. Vols. II y III. *Madrid:* Imp. Latina, 1924. 287 and 236 pp.

Benavente, J. — Conferencias. *Madrid:* Sucesores de Hernando, 1924. 297 pp. 7 pes.

Espronceda.—Obras poéticas. *Barcelona:* B. Bauzá, 1923. 304 pp. 2 pes.

Feijóo. — Teatro crítico universal. II. Selección, prólogo y notas de A. Millares Carlo. *Madrid:* "La Lectura," 1924. 300 pp. 5 pes. (Clásicos Castellanos, 53).

Guerlin, H.—L'Espagne moderne vue par ses écrivains. *Paris:* Perrin et Cie., 1924. 324 pp. Fr. 7.

Hamilton, A., and Van Horne, J.—Elementary Spanish Grammar. *New York:* The Century Co., 1924. 336 pp. $1.50.

Knight, W. E.—Norte y sur. Geografía, historia y cuento. *Richmond, Va.:* Johnson, 1924. 253 pp. $1.36.

Larra.—Artículos de crítica literaria y artística. II. Edic. de J. R. Lomba y Pedraja. *Madrid:* "La Lectura," 1923. xxviii + 317 pp. 5 pes. (Clásicos Castellanos, 52.)

Lope de Rueda.—A estudiar a Salamanca. Los palos merecidos. Pasos de comedia. Edic. B. del Amo. *Madrid:* A. Marzo, 1923. 32 pp. 1 pes.

Morales, M. de la L.—Historias de Lope de Vega relatadas a los niños. *Barcelona:* Araluce, 1924. 122 pp. 2.50 pes.

Navarro Tomás, T.—Introducción a las obras de Garcilaso. Prólogo de la segunda edición de las obras de Garcilaso, en "Clásicos Castellanos." Vol. III. *Madrid:* Imp. "Artes de la Ilustración," 1924. lxiii pp.

Palau y Dulcet, A.—Manual del librero hispanoamericano. Inventario bibliográfico de la producción científica y literaria de España y de la América latina desde la invención de la imprenta hasta nuestros días, con el valor comercial de todos los artículos descritos. Vol. I: A-B. *Barcelona:* Lib. Antiquaria, 1923. xxxix + 295 pp. 30 pes. (Diccionario geográfico-tipográfico, xxi-xxxix.)

Palma, R.—Tradiciones peruanas. Tomo I. *Madrid:* Jiménez Molina, 1923. xxv + 352 pp. 14 pes. (Edición publicada bajo los auspicios del Gobierno del Perú.)

Pitollet, C.—Blasco Ibáñez, paisajista. Veintiocho descripciones sacadas por orden cronológico de las principales obras. *Paris:* Edit. Vuibert, 1924. 130 pp.

Quevedo. — Obras maestras. *Madrid:* Sucesores de Rivadeneyra, 1923. 858 pp. 5 pes.

San Juan de la Cruz.—El cántico espiritual. Según el manuscrito de las Madres Carmelitas de Jaén. Edición y notas de M. Martínez Burgos. *Madrid:* Edic. de "La Lectura," 1924. lv + 360 pp. 5 pes. (Clásicos Castellanos, 55.)

Shapiro, A. A.—A Beginner's Spanish Grammar. *Chapel Hill, N. C.:* The University of North Carolina, 1924. 263 pp.

Tercer Congreso de Estudios Vascos. Recopilación de los trabajos de dicha Asamblea, celebrada en Guernica del 10 al 17 de septiembre de 1922. *San Sebastián:* Imp. de la Diputación de Guipúzcoa, 1923. 160 pp. (Publicación de la Sociedad de Estudios Vascos.)

GENERAL

Festskrift tillägnad Hugo Pipping på hans sextioårsdag den 5 november 1924. [Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland, CLXXV]. *Helsingfors:* 1924. xii + 607 pp.

Flom, George T.—The Use of Small Capitals in Medial and Final Position in the earliest Old Norwegian MSS. [Repr. fr. Festkrift Hugo Pipping]. *Helsingfors:* 1924. Pp. 100-113.

Leumann, Ernst.—Die neueren Arbeiten zur indogerm. Metrik [Aus Zs. f. vergl. Sprachforschung. Bd. 52, H. 3/4.] *Göttingen:* Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1924. Pp. 161-193. M. 1.50.

Jourdain, E. F.—The drama in Europe in theory and practice. *New York:* Holt, 1924. 198 pp. $2.25.

Nicoll, Allardyce.—An introduction to dramatic theory. *New York:* Brentano's. 1924. 218 pp. $2.50.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Baker, Ernest A.—The History of the English Novel: The Age of Romance from the Beginnings to the Renaissance. *London:* Witherby, 1924.

Bosanquet, Theodora.—Henry James at Work. *London:* Hogarth Press, 1924. 33 pp. 2s. 6d.

Braybrooke, Patrick.—J. M. Barrie, A Study in Fairies and Mortals. *London:* Dranes, 1924. 162 pp. 7s. 6d.

Brown, Arthur C. L.—The Grail and the English "Sir Perceval." [Reprinted from *Modern Philology,* XVI, XVII, XVIII, XIX, and XXII.]

Bullett, Gerald.—Walt Whitman: A Study and Selection. *London:* Grant Richards, 1925. 166 pp. 15s.

Clark, Barrett H.—A Study of Modern Drama. *New York:* Appleton and Co., 1925. $3.50.

Clark, Donald L.—Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance. *New York:* Columbia University Press, 1924. Pp. 166. $2.50.

Fausset, H. l'A.—John Donne. *New York:* American Library Service, 1925.

Forbis, John F.—The Shakespearean Enigma and An Elizabethan Mania. *New York:* American Library Service, 1925. $4.50.

Galsworthy, John.—On Expression [The English Association, Pamphlet No. 59]. *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press, 1924. 18 pp. 85 cts.

Greenwood, Sir George.—The Shakespeare Signatures and "Sir Thomas More." *London:* Cecil Palmer, 1924.

Hardy, Thomas.—Life and Art. *New York:* Greenberg, 1925. $3.50.

Harrison, G. B.—The Story of Elizabethan Drama. *Cambridge, Eng.:* The University Press, 1924. 134 pp. 5s.

Joad, C. E. M.—Samuel Butler. (1835-1902). *London:* Leonard Parsons, 1925. 195 pp. 4s. 6d.

Lowell, Amy. — John Keats. *Boston:* Houghton Mifflin Co., 1925. 2 volumes.

Mayne, Ethel Colburn. — Byron. *New York:* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925. $5.00.

Morley, John.—Edmund Burke. *New York:* Alfred Knopf, 1925.

Peacock.—The Works of Thomas Love Peacock. Volumes I, II, III, and IV. *New York:* Gabriel Wells, 1925.

Pollard, A. W., Greg, W. W., Thompson, E. M., Wilson, J. D., and Chambers, R. W.—Shakespeare's Hand in the Play of "Sir Thomas More." *Cambridge, Eng.:* Cambridge University Press, 1924.

Quiller-Couch, Sir Arthur.—Adventures in Criticism. *New York:* Putnam, 1925. $2.50.

Richards, I. A.—Principles of Literary Criticism. *London:* Kegan Paul, 1924. Pp. 290. 10s. 6d.

Sampson, George.—The Cambridge Book of Prose and Verse, in illustration of English Literature from the beginnings to the Cycles of Romance. *New York:* Macmillan, 1924. xxxviii + 438 pp.

Schuster, George N.—Prose and Poetry of Cardinal Newman. With Introduction and Notes. *New York:* Allyn and Bacon, 1925. $0.60.

Simpson, Evelyn M.—A Study of the Prose Works of John Donne. *Oxford:* The Clarendon Press, 1924. 15s.

Williams, Orlo.—Contemporary Criticism of Literature. *London:* Leonard Parsons, 1924. 224 pp. 7s. 6d.

Williams, Randall.—The Wessex Novels of Thomas Hardy. An Appreciative Study. *London:* Dent and Co., 1924. 157 pp. 6s.

Yvon, Paul.—Horace Walpole as a Poet. *Paris:* Presses Universitaires de France, 1924. Pp. 217.

GERMAN

Ahrendt, Ernst H.—Der Riese in der mhd. Epik. Diss. *Rostock:* 1924. 126 pp.

Baxa, Jakob.—Gesellschaft und Staat im Spiegel deutscher Romantik. Die staats- u. gesellschaftswissenschaftlichen Schriften deutscher Romantiker, ausgewählt, mit erklärenden Einl. u. Anm. versehen u. hrsg. [Die Herdflamme, Bd. 8]. *Jena:* Fischer, 1924. viii + 664 pp.

Becker, H.—Napoleon oder die hundert Tage. Drama in fünf Aufzügen von Grabbe. Diss. *Marburg:* 1924. 64 pp.

Dehnow, Fritz.—Ludwig Thoma. *München:* Langen 1925. 162 pp. Boards, M. 2.

Errante, Vincenzo.—Paraphrasen über Lenau. Eingel. v. Paul Wertheimer. *München:* Verl. f. Kulturpolitik, 1924. xxviii + 166 pp.

Goldschmit, Rud. K.—Sturm und Drang in 1 Bd. [Diotima Klassiker]. *Stuttgart:* Hädecke, 1924. 399 pp.

Grillparzer, Franz.—Sämtliche Werke. Hist.-krit. Gesamtausg. Hrsg. v. A. Sauer. Abt. 1, Bd. 7. *Wien:* Schroll [1924]. xxxii + 250 pp.

Haller, Lilli. — Julie Bondeli. [Die Schweiz im deu. Geistesleben, 34]. *Leipzig:* H. Haessel, 1924. 69 pp. Boards, M. 2.

Illig, Udo.—Das Salzburger Fragment der sächsischen Weltchronik, untersucht u. hrsg. [Veröffentl. d. hist. Seminars. d. Univ. Graz. 2]. *Graz:* Leuschner and Lubensky, 1924. 53 pp.

Jahrbuch der Sammlung Kippenberg. Bd. 4. *Leipzig:* Insel, 1924. 330 pp. Bound, M. 5.

Kommerell, Max.—Jean Pauls Verhältnis zu Rousseau. Nach den Hauptromanen dargestellt [Beitr. z. deu. Literaturwiss. Nr. 23]. *Marburg:* Elwert, 1925. xi + 179 pp. M. 7.50.

Köster, Albert.—Die deutsche Literatur der Aufklärungszeit. Fünf Kapitel aus der Literaturgeschichte des 18. Jhs. mit e. Anhang: Die allgemeinen Tendenzen der Geniebewegung. *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1925. xi + 298 pp. M. 10.

Nadler, Jos.—Das Schrifttum der Sudetendeutschen, 1. Bis zur Schlacht am Weissen Berge. *Regensburg:* Habbel, 1924. viii + 188 pp. Bound, M. 2.50.

Nestroy, Johann. — Sämtliche Werke. Histor.-krit. Gesamtausg. in 12 Bdn. Hrsg. v. Fritz Brukner u. Otto Rommel. *Wien:* Schroll [1924].

Öhmann, Emil.—Der S-Plural im Deutschen. [Annales academiae scientiarum fennicae. B, tom. 18, Nr. 1]. *Helsinki:* Finnische Literaturgesellschaft, 1924. 127 pp.

Rahel (Varnhagen) und Alexander v. d. Marwitz in ihren Briefen. Ein Bild aus d. Zeit d. Romantiker. Nach d. Orig. hrsg. v. H. Meisner. *Gotha:* Friedr. Perthes, 1925. 311 pp. Cloth, M. 7.

Salomon, Gerhard.—E. T. A. Hoffmann. Bibliographie. *Weimar:* E. Lichtenstein 1924. 80 pp. Boards, M. 4.

Sergel, Albert.—Saat und Ernte. Die deutsche Lyrik um 1925. In Selbstauswahlen der Dichter u. Dichterinnen. Mit kurzen Eigenbiographien u. Angabe ihrer Werke. *Berlin:* Bong (1924). 502 pp.

Wendel, Georg.—Dichter der Romantik. *Berlin:* E. Ebering, 1924. 31 pp. M. 1.20.

FRENCH

Bally, Gustav.—Psychologische Phänomene im Bedeutungswandel. *Bern:* P. Haupt, 1924. 85 pp. 8°. M. 2.80.

Barker, F. L.—Effective French for Beginners. *New York:* Scribner's, 1924. xxix + 374 pp.

Becker, Philipp August. — Mellin de Saint-Gelais. Eine krit. Studie. *Wien:* Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky A. G., 1924. 101 pp. 8°. Gm. 1. (Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philos.-hist. Kl., Sitzungsberichte, Bd. 200, Abh. 4.)

—— Christophle de Longueil. sein Leben u. sein Briefwechsel. *Bonn:* K. Schroeder, 1924. viii + 214 pp. 4°. Gm. 10. (Veröffentlichungen d. roman. Auslandsinstituts der rhein. Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn. Bd. 5).

—— Bonaventure des Periers als Dichter und Erzähler. *Wien:* Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky A. G., 1924. 99 pp. 8°. Gm. 1. (Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philos.-hist. Kl. Sitzungsberichte, Bd. 200. Abh. 3.)

Curtius, Ernst Robert.—Balzac. *Bonn:* Friedrich Cohen, 1923. 545 pp. 8°.

De Sauzé, E. B.—Contes gais. *Philadelphia:* John C. Winston Co., 1924. 189 pp.

Dumas, A.—La Dame aux Camélias. Edit. by H. A. Smith and R. B. Mitchell. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924. xii + 201 pp.

Guillaume de Lorris.—Der Roman von der Rose. Deutsche Uebersetzung von Heinrich Fährmann, erneuert durch Joseph Gregor, mit Nachwort von Emil Winkler. *Wien, Prag, Leipzig:* Ed. Strache, 1922. clxxxv + xlviii pp. 8°.

Haas, Joseph.—Um Balzacs "Lilie im Tal." *Tübingen:* Selbstverlag, 1924. 81 pp. 8°. M. 3.

Hatzfeld, Helmut.—Die französische Renaissancelyrik. *München:* M. Hueber. 1924. vii + 207 pp. 8°. M. 5.50. (Epochen der französischen Literatur, 2.)

—— Ueber Bedeutungsverschiebung durch Formähnlichkeit im Neufranzösischen. Eine semasiolog.-lexikograph. Studie. *München:* M. Hueber, 1924. viii + 130 pp. 8°. M. 7.50.

Hue de Rotelande.—Protheselaus. Ein altfranz. Abenteuerroman. Bd. 1. *Göttingen:* 1924. *Halle a. S.:* M. Niemeyer. xiii + 490 pp. M. 25.

Marie di Francia.—Eliduc. Riveduto nel testo, con versione a fronte, introduzione e commento a cura di Ezio Levi. *Firenze:* Sansoni. 127 pp. 8°. L. 8. (Biblioteca Sansoniana Straniera diretta da Guido Manacorda, XCIV.)

Moraud, M.—French Composition. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924. 131 pp.

Mott, Lewis F. — Sainte-Beuve. *New York:* D. Appleton & Co., 1925. xiii + 521 pp. $5.00.

Murger, H.—Scènes de la vie de Bohème. ed. by J. Van Horne. *New York:* The Century Co., 1924. viii + 260 pp. $1.25.

Musset, G.—Glossaire des patois de l'Aunis et de la Saintonge, avec dessins et

illustrations. Avec la collaboration de M. Pellison et Ch. Vigen. *Paris:* Champion, 1924. Fr. 100.

Onomastica.—I. Paul Aebischer, Sur la formation des noms de famille dans le canton de Fribourg (Suisse).—II. Dante Olivieri, I cognomi della Venezia Euganea Saggio d'uno studio storico-etimologico. *Genève:* 1924. 272 pp. 8°. L. 50. (Biblioteca dell' Archivum Romanicum. Serie II, Linguistica 6.)

Pargment, M. S.—Le Français oral. *New York:* Heath, 1924. viii + 322 pp.

Patterson, S. G.—Intermediate French Prose Composition and Conversation Builder. *New York:* Benj. H. Sanborn and Co., 1924. ix + 261 pp.

Payen-Payne, De V.—French Idioms and Proverbs. Seventh Ed., Revised and Enlarged. *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press, 1924. 288 pp. $1.50.

Ripman, W.—First Steps in French. *New York:* E. P. Dutton and Co., 1924. viii + 182 pp. $1.00.

Sandeau, J. — Mademoiselle de la Seiglière, ed. by L. De Vries. *New York:* Allyn and Bacon, 1924. xii + 187 pp. 80 cts.

Spring, H. P.—Chateaubriand at the Crossways. *New York:* Columbia University Press, 1924. xviii + 195 pp.

v. Wartburg, Walther.—Frz. etymologisches Wörterbuch. Lieferung Nr. 6. *Bonn:* Schroeder, 1925. Pp. 353-416. M. 3.

Waslet, J.—Vocabulaire wallon-français (dialecte givetois). *Sedan:* Impr. Laroche, 1923. 320 pp. 8°.

ITALIAN

Ariosto, Ludovico.—Lirica, a cura di G. Fatini. *Bari:* G. Laterza e figli, 1924. 379 pp. L. 25. (Scrittori d' Italia, no. 95.)

Aubel, E.—Commemorazione di Niccolò Tommaseo, tenuta il giorno 14 maggio 1924, nel cinquantenario della morte. *Trieste:* La Società dalmatica ed. (fratelli Mosettig), 1924. 31 pp.

Battelli, G.—Le più belle leggende cristiane tratte da codici e da antiche stampe commentate e illustrate. Con un preambolo di M. Scherillo. *Milano:* U. Hoepli, 1924. xxviii + 594 pp.

Boldrin, G.—Angelo Beolco detto il Ruzzante. Cenni pubblicati a cura del comitato per le onoranze. *Padova:* Tip. L. Penada, 1924. 66 pp. L. 5.

Busato, A.—Il sistema penale nell' Inferno di Dante. Nota esegetica. *Pesaro:* Tip. Buona Stampa, 1924. 14 pp.

Busato, G.—Poeti contro luce: parodie di Luciano Folgore. *Trento:* Tip. Tridentum, 1924. 44 pp.

Collino, L.—Storia della poesia dialettale piemontese dalle origini sino ad Angelo Brofferio, con molti documenti inediti o rari. *Torino:* G. B. Paravia e C., 1924. iv + 216 pp. L. 17.

Frediani, V. — Appunti ditirambici a sfondo leggermente polemico, con in appendice il ditirambo di Virgilio Spada ritenuto finora introvabile. *Bologna:* Tip. L. Parma, 1924. 48 pp.

Giammusso, Filomena.—Redenzione del pessimismo leopardiano. *Girgenti:* Tip. L. Dimora e C., 1924. 51 pp.

Griffiths, E. T.—Li Chantari di Lancellotto. Edited with introduction, notes, and glossary, by —. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924. 203 pp. $2.50.

Guerrieri, A.—Le fiabe di Carlo Gozzi. Saggio critico. *Catania:* Off. tip. L'Illustrazione siciliana, 1924. 126 pp. L. 5.

Leopardi, Giacomo.—I canti, con la vita del poeta narrata di su l'epistolario da M. Scherillo. Quinta edizione, ritoccata e accresciuta. *Milano:* U. Hoepli, 1924. xii + 510 pp. L. 12.50. (Biblioteca classica hoepliana.)

Livorno a Giovanni Pascoli, VI luglio MCMXXIV. *Livorno:* R. Giusti, 1924. 56 pp. L. 10.

Machiavelli, Niccolò.—Il principe e altri scritti minori, a cura di M. Scherillo. Precede una lettera di A. Salandra. Seconda edizione rinnovata. *Milano:* U. Hoepli, 1924. xi + 520 pp. L. 15. (Biblioteca classica Hoepliana.)

Merenda, L.—Hercules. Dramma inedito, a cura di O. Tescari. *Torino:* G. B. Paravia e C., 1924. 72 pp.

Morelli, G.—La satira e gli ordini mendicanti nel secolo XIII. *Torino:* G. B. Paravia e C., 1924. 101 pp.

Nievo, Ippolito.—Pagine e poesie scelte (dalle "Confessioni di un ottuagenario" e dal "Canzoniere"), a cura di A. Biancotti. *Torino:* G. B. Paravia e C., 1924. 150 pp. L. 6.30.

Petrarca, Francesco.—Le rime. Con introduzione e note di E. Bellorini. Vol. I. *Torino:* Unione tipografico-editrice, 1924. xxviii + 230 pp. L. 8. (Collezione di classici italiani con note, LII.)

Rinaldi, A.—I crepuscolari (G. Gozzano, S. Corazzini). *S. Maria Capua V.:* Casa ed. "La Fiaccola," di D. Di Rubba, 1924. 101 pp. L. 3.

Sciuto, Valentina.—Il "Trinummus," il "Mercator," la "Casina" di Plauto; la

"Dote," la "Stiava," i "Rivali" del Cecchi. *Catania:* V. Giannotta, 1924. 110 pp. L. 7.

Zaccaria, E.—"Meda," "metto," "medone," ossia storia d'una parola indogermanica e suo ingresso in italiano. *Modena:* Tip. Immacolata Concezione, 1924. 18 pp. L. 3.

Zonta, G. — L'anima dell' ottocento. *Torino:* G. B. Paravia e C., 1924. 223 pp. L. 10.50. (Biblioteca Paravia "Storia e pensiero," no. 3.)

SPANISH

Darío, Rubén.—Páginas de arte. *Madrid:* G. Hernández y G. Sáez, 1924. 245 pp. 6 pes.

De Lollis, C.—Cervantes reazionario. *Roma:* Istituto Cristoforo Colombo (tip. La Casa del libro), 1924. ii + 241 pp. L. 10. (Pubblicazioni dell' Istituto Cristoforo Colombo.)

Figueiredo, A. de.—Espanha. *Lisboa:* Aillaud e Bertrand, 1924. 451 pp. 12 coronas.

Icaza, F. A. de.—Conquistadores y pobladores de Nueva España. Diccionario autobiográfico sacado de los textos originales. Dos volúmenes. *Segovia:* Imp. de "El Adelantado," 1923. xci + 257, 357 pp. 30 pes.

Menéndez Pidal, R.—Poesía juglaresca y juglares. *Madrid:* Junta para ampliación de estudios e investigaciones científicas. Centro de Estudios Históricos, 1924. viii + 488 pp. 14 pes. (Publicaciones de la "Revista de Filología Española," VII.)

Moncada, F. de.—Expedición de los catalanes y aragoneses contra turcos y griegos. Prólogo y notas de S. Gili Gaya. *Madrid:* "La Lectura," 1924. 368 pp. 5 pes. (Clásicos Castellanos, 54.)

Moratín, L. F.—Teatro: La comedia nueva. El sí de las niñas. Edición, prólogo y notas de F. Ruiz Morcuende. *Madrid:* "La Lectura," 1924. 302 pp. 5 pes. (Clásicos Castellanos, 58.)

Pérez, P. N.—Religiosos de la Merced que pasaron a la América española. Primera parte: Siglo XVI; segunda parte: Siglos XVII y XVIII. Con documentos del Archivo general de Indias. *Sevilla:* 1923. 314 and 165 pp. (Publicaciones del Centro Oficial de Estudios Americanistas de Sevilla. Biblioteca Colonial Americana, Tomos IX y XII.)

Pfandl, L.—Spanische Kultur und Sitte des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts. Eine Einführung in die Blütezeit der spanischen Literatur und Kunst. *Kempten:* J. Kösel und F. Pustet, 1924. xv + 288 pp.

Quevedo.—Obras satíricas y festivas. Prólogo y notas de J. M. Salaverría. *Madrid:* "La Lectura," 1924. 258 pp. 5 pes. (Clásicos Castellanos, 56.)

Rodríguez Marín, F.—Nuevos datos para las biografías de cien escritores de los siglos XVI y XVII. *Madrid:* "Revista de Archivos," 1924. 10 pes.

Teresa de Jesus.—La vida de la Madre —. escrita de su misma mano. Introd. Georges Cirot. *Strasbourg:* J. H. E. Heitz, 1924. xxxvii + 138 pp. M. 1.20. (Biblioteca española. Bibliotheca romanica, 291-294.)

Vega, Lope de.—Ya anda la de Mazagatos. Comedia desconocida atribuída a —. Publicada con notas y estudio por S. Griswold Morley. *Bordeaux:* Feret et fils, 1924. 111 pp. (Repr. fr. the "Bulletin hispanique.")

Williams, E. B.—The Life and Dramatic Works of Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda. *Philadelphia, Pa.:* The University of Pennsylvania, 1924. 116 pp. (Publications of the University of Pennsylvania. Series in Romanic Languages and Literatures, no. 11).

Zettersteen, K. V.—Ein Handbuch der religiösen Pflichten der Muhammedaner in Aljamía. Herausgegeben von —. *Uppsala:* 1921. Pp. 1-174. (Repr. fr. "Le Monde oriental," XV.)

GENERAL

Baehrens, W. A.—Sprachlicher Kommentar zur vulgärlateinischen Appendix Probi. *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1922. 130 pp. 8°.

Lehmann, Paul.—Die Parodie im Mittelalter. *München:* Drei Masken Verlag. 1922. 252 pp.

—— Parodistische Texte. Beispiele zur lateinischen Parodie im Mittelalter. *München:* Drei Masken Verlag, 1923. 74 pp.

Neue Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft und Jugendbildung, hrsg. von Johannes Ilberg. 1. Jgg., 1. Hft. *Leipzig:* B. G. Teubner, 1925. 160 pp., lex. 8°. M. 4.80.

Streitberg Festgabe, hrsg. von der Direktion der vereinigten sprachwissenschaftlichen Institute an der Univ. zu Leipzig. *Leipzig:* Markert & Petters, 1924. xv – 441 pp., lex. 8°. Bound, M. 30.

Van Tieghem, P.—Le Mouvement Romantique (Angleterre, Allemagne, Italie, France). 2e. édit. *Paris:* Librairie Vuibert 1925. 7 Fr.

Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie. Hrsg. v. Max Vasmer. Bd. 1, Hft 1, 2. *Leipzig:* Markert & Petters, 1924. 256 pp. M. 28 per volume (4 numbers).

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Burrill, W. H.—Literary Vespers. First Series. Altars of Aspiration. *New York:* Duffield and Co., 1924. $2.00.

Butler, Samuel.—Selected Modern English Essays. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1925.

Draper, John W.—William Mason. A Study in Eighteenth Century Culture. New York University Press, 1924. xv + 397 pp.

Hazard, Caroline.—From College Gates. *Boston and New York:* Houghton Mifflin Co., 1925.

Hicks, Philip M.—The Development of the Natural History Essay in American Literature. Diss. *Philadelphia:* Univ. of Penna., 1924. 167 pp.

Jane, L. C.—Asser's Life of King Alfred. [Translated.] *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1925. $1.85.

Jordan, Richard.—Handbuch der mittelenglischen Grammatik. 1. Teil: Lautlehre. [German. Bibliothek, I. Abt.: Samml. Germ. Elementar- und Handbücher. 1. Reihe: Grammatiken, 13.] *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1925. xvi + 273 pp. M. 6.30.

Krutch, Joseph Wood.—Comedy and Conscience After the Restoration. *New York:* Columbia Univ. Press, 1924. $2.50.

Longaker, John M.—The Della Cruscans and William Gifford. Diss. *Philadelphia:* Univ. of Penna., 1924. 67 pp.

Lyman, Rollo L., and Howard C. Hill.—Literature and Living. Books One to Three. Junior High School Series. *New York:* Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1925. $4.60.

Madeleva, Sister M.—Chaucer's Nuns. *New York:* Appleton and Co., 1925. $1.50.

Meissner, Paul.—Der Bauer in der englischen Literatur. [Bonner Studien zur englischen Philologie, Heft xv.] *Bonn:* Peter Hanstein, 1922. Pp. 211. Mk. 2.15.

Opdycke, John B.—The Literature of Letters. *New York:* Lyons and Carnahan, 1925.

Quinn, Arthur H.—Representative American Plays. *New York:* The Century Co., 1925. $4.00.

Reilly, Joseph J.—Newman as a Man of Letters. *New York:* Macmillan, 1925. $2.50.

Richards, I. A.—Principles of Literary Criticism. *New York:* Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1925.

Saintsbury.—The Collected Essays and Papers of George Saintsbury. 1875-1923. Vol. IV. *New York:* Dutton and Co., 1925. $4.50.

Schoenberger, Harold W. — American Adaptations of French Plays on the New York and Philadelphia Stages from 1790 to 1833. Diss. *Philadelphia:* Univ. of Penna., 1924. 99 pp.

Schönemann, Friedrich.—Mark Twain als literarische Persönlichkeit. [Jenaer German. Forschungen, 8.] *Jena:* Frommann, 1925. 119 pp. M. 6.20.

Serjeantson, Mary S.—Distribution of Dialect Characters in Middle English. *Amsterdam:* Swets and Zeitlinger, 1924.

Shackford, Martha Hale. — Hyperion. [Repr. from *Studies in Philology,* XXII, 1.] Pp. 48-60.

—— Keats and Adversity. [Repr. from *The Sewanee Review,* Oct., 1924.] 16 pp.

GERMAN

Benjamin, W.—Der Begriff der Kunstkritik in der deutschen Romantik. [Herbertz' Neue Berner Abhandlungen, 5. H.]. *Bern:* A. Francke, 1924. F. 7.50.

Brentano, Clemens, und Apollonia Diepenbrock. Eine Seelenfreundschaft in Briefen. 25 Brentanobriefe hrsg., eingel., u. m. Anm. vers v. Ewald Reinhard. [Romantische Bücherei, Hft. 51, 52]. *München:* Parcus & Co. [1924]. 78 pp., boards, M. 2.

Dam, J. van.—Das Veldeke-Problem. *Groningen:* J. B. Wolters, 1924. 75 pp.

Einem, Charlotte v.—Aus dem Nachlass Charlottens von Einem. Ungedruckte Briefe von Hölty, Voss, Boie, Overbeck u. a. Jugenderinnerungen. Hrsg. v. J. Steinberger. *Göttingen:* Ver. Götting. Bücherfreunde, 1924. 175 pp.

Festschrift zum 19. Neuphilologentag in Berlin, 1.-4. Okt. 1924. *Berlin:* O. Stollberg & Co. [1925]. 90 pp. M. 1.

Heine, Heinrich. — Sämtliche Werke. Hrsg. v. Fritz Strich. 11 Bde. *München:* Müller, 1925. 4°.

Hirschfeld, Georg.—Otto Brahm. Briefe und Erinnerungen, mitgeteilt. *Berlin:* G. Stilke, 1925. 280 pp. M. 6.

Houben, H. H.—J. P. Eckermann. Sein Leben für Goethe. Nach s. neuaufgefundenen Tagebüchern u. Briefen dargestellt. *Leipzig:* H. Haessel, 1925. xxi + 635 pp. Cloth, M. 10.

Jahresbericht über die wissenschaftlichen Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der neueren deutschen Literatur. Hrsg. v. d. Literaturarchiv-Ges. in Berlin. (N. F., Bd.

2). Bibliographie 1922. *Berlin:* de Gruyter, 1924. x + 172 pp. M. 10.

Jong, C. M. de.—Gottfried von Neifen. Diss. *Amsterdam:* H. J. Paris, 1924. Fl. 3.90.

Kleczkowski, Adam.—Neuentdeckte altsächsische Psalmenfragmente aus der Karolingerzeit. Tl. 1. [Prace komisji językowej Polskiej Akademji Umiejetności. Nr. 12]. *Krakau:* Gebethner & Wolff, 1924 66 pp.

Kohlmeyer, Otto.—Hyperion. Eine pädagogische Hölderlinstudie. *Frankfurt a. M.:* Diesterweg, 1924. vi + 118 pp. M 3.30.

König, Fritz.—Georg Büchners "Danton." [Bausteine z. Gesch. d. deu. Lit. 19.] *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1924. viii + 85 pp. M. 3.

Konrad von Würzburg.—Kleinere Dichtungen. Hrsg. v. Ed. Schröder. 1. Der Welt Lohn. Herzmaere. Heinrich von Kempten. *Berlin:* Weidmann, 1924. xxiv + 72 pp. M. 2.

Korff, H. A.—Humanismus und Romantik. Die Lebensauffassung der Neuzeit und ihre Entwicklung im Zeitalter Goethes. 5 Vorträge über Literaturgeschichte. *Leipzig:* J. J. Weber [1924]. iv + 142 pp. M. 3.20.

Köster, Albert.—Die deutsche Literatur der Aufklärungszeit. 5 Kapitel aus d. Literaturgesch. d. 18. Jh. m. e. Anh.: Die allgemeinen Tendenzen der Geniebewegung. (Vorw. d. Hrsg.: Jul. Petersen.) *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1925. xi + 298 pp. Bound, M. 12.

Rath, H. W.—Mörikes Epistel "An Longus" und ihre komi-tragische Vorgeschichte zum ersten Male auf Grund der Quellen dargestellt [Schriften der Ges. d. Mörikefreunde. Bd. 4]. *Ludwigsburg:* C. F. Schulz, 1924. 147 pp.

Renker, Armin.—Georg Büchner und das Lustspiel der Romantik. Eine Studie über Leonce u. Lena. [German. Studien. H. 34]. *Berlin:* Ebering, 1924. 132 pp. M. 4.

Rose, W.—From Goethe to Byron. The Development of "Weltschmerz" in German Literature from Werther to the Beginning of the Romantic Movement. *London:* G. Routledge, 1924. 7s. 6d.

Rotth, Emmy.—Erinnerungen an Cäsar Flaischlen. *Hannover:* A. Sponholtz [1924]. 166 pp. M. 3.60.

Saraux, Chr.—Niederdeutsche Forschungen 2. Die Flexion der mittelniederdeutschen Sprache [Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Hist.-filol. meddelelser. X, 1.]. *Kopenhagen:* Høst & Søn, 1924. 284 pp.

Schidrowitz, Leo.—Der unbegabte Goethe. Die Anti-Goethe-Kritik aus der Goethe-Zeit. *Leipzig:* Fleischer, 1925. 220 pp., Bound, M. 5.

Schneider, Ferd. Jos.—Die deutsche Dichtung vom Ausgang des Barocks bis zum Beginn des Klassizismus 1700-1785. [Epochen d. deutschen Lit. Bd. 3]. *Stuttgart:* J. B. Metzler, 1924. xi + 492 pp. Cloth, M. 11.

Schröder, Edw.—Der Dichter des deutschen 'Eraclius.' Ein Beitr. zur altbayer. Literaturgesch. [Sitzungsber. d. Bayer. Akad., Philos. philol. u. hist. Kl. Jg. 1924. Abh. 3]. *München:* G. Franz, 1924. 18 pp. 60 Pf.

Schullerus, Adolf.—Luthers Sprache in Siebenbürgen. Forschungen zur siebenb. Geistes- u. Sprachgeschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation. Hälfte 1. [S.-A. aus Archiv des Vereins f. siebenb. Landeskunde, Bd. 41, H. 1.]. *Hermannstadt:* W. Krafft, 1923. 296 pp. M. 3.

Schultze, Johanna.—Die Auseinandersetzungen zwischen Adel und Bürgertum in den deutschen Zss. der letzten drei Jahrzehnte des 18. Jhs. (1773-1806). [Historische Studien. H. 163]. *Berlin:* E. Ebering, 1925. xi + 172 pp. M. 6.

Schulze, Wilhelm.—Die reduplizierten Praeterita des Tocharischen u. des Germanischen. [Sitzungsber. d. preuss. Akad. d. W. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1924, xx-xxv, S. 166-174]. *Berlin:* 1924.

Wadepuhl, Walter.—Goethe and America. [Repr. fr. Deutsch-Amerikanische Geschichtsblätter, 1923]. *Urbana, Ill.:* 1925. 32 pp.

Wittmann, Karl.—Die Vergleiche in den Dramen Grabbes. Diss. *Giessen:* 1924. 28 pp.

Wolff, H.—Versuch einer Geschichte des Geniebegriffs in der deutschen Aesthetik des 18. Jhs. I. Diss. *Leyden:* 1924.

Wunderlich, H. u. H. Reis.—Der deutsche Satzbau. 3. vollst. umgearb. Aufl. 1. Bd. *Stuttgart,* Cotta, 1924. xiii + 469 pp. M. 8.

FRENCH

Atkinson, Geoffroy.—Les relations de voyages du XVIIe siècle et l'évolution des idées. *Paris:* Champion. vi + 220.

Becque, Henry.—Les Corbeaux, ed. by E. A. Dawson. *New York:* Heath, 1925. xviii + 173.

Caillat, J.—Le Voyage d'Alphonse Daudet en Algérie. *Alger:* Carbonel et *Paris:* Champion, 1924. 216 pp.

Champion, Pierre.—Pierre de Ronsard et Amadis Jamin. *Paris:* Champion, 1924. 30 pp. + 13 plates.

Citoleux, Marc.—Alfred de Vigny. *Paris:* Champion, 1924. xvi + 654.

Dumas.—L'histoire d'un casse-noisette.

New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1924. 34 pp. 15 cts.

Faÿ, Bernard.—Bibliographie critique des ouvrages français relatifs aux Etats-Unis (1770-1800). *Paris:* Champion, 1925. Pp. 108.

Green, F. C. and Fort, J. B.—French Composition. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924. 62 pp. $1.10.

Kerby, W. M.—The Life, Diplomatic Career and Literary Activities of Nicolas Germain Léonard. *Paris:* Champion. 1925. xx + 471.

Lachèvre, Frédéric.—Les Derniers Libertins. *Paris:* Champion, 1924. xv + 412 pp.

Lanson, G.—Méthodes de l'histoire littéraire. *Paris:* Les Belles Lettres, 1925. 57 pp. (*Les Etudes Françaises:* premier cahier).

Lister, F.—French Grammar. *Boston:* Ginn, 1924. iii + 56 pp. 80 cts.

Luppé, comte de.—Les jeunes filles à la fin du XVIIIe siècle. *Paris:* Champion, 1925. viii + 256.

—— Lettres de Geneviève de Malboissière. *Paris:* Champion, 1925. xxxv + 379.

Osgood, F. H.—Poésies choisies pour la jeunesse. *Boston:* Ginn, 1925. vii + 182 pp. 84 cts.

Parker, C. S.—The Defense of the Child by French Novelists. *Menasha, Wisconsin:* 1925. xi + 140.

Sand, G.—La petite Fadette. *New York:* Longmans, Green and Co., 1924. 43 pp. 25 cts.

Seronde, Joseph.—Extraits de l'histoire de la civilisation française par Alfred Rambaud. *New York:* Holt, 1925. v + 283.

Töpffer, R.—Le lac de Gers et le Col d'Anterne. *New York:* Longmans, Green and Co., 1924. 47 pp. 25 cts.

Van Tieghem, Paul.—Le Préromantisme. Etudes d'histoire littéraire européenne. *Paris:* Rieder, 1924. 298 pp. Frcs. 15.

Voltaire.—Zadig. *New York:* Longmans, Green and Co., 1924. 47 pp. 25 cts.

Wright, C. H. C.—A History of French Literature (new edition). *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1925. xiv + 990 pp. $3.50.

ITALIAN

Alfieri, Vittorio.—Vita scritta da esso. *Firenze:* A. Salani, 1924. 402 pp. L. 5.75. (I classici, edizione Florentia, no. 14.)

Bacchi, V.—In memoria del card. Francesco Battaglini, arcivescovo di Bologna, nell'anno centenario della sua nascita. (I. Commemorazione del Battaglini filosofo e maestro. II. Su l'allegoria generale della Divina Commedia. III. Il concetto cristiano, ai tempi di Dante, del principato civile dei papi.) *Bologna:* Soc. tip. già Compositori, 1923. 78 pp.

Bernardini, U.—Cesare Lucchesini, Antonio Mezzanotte e Giuseppe Borghi traduttori di Pindaro al principio del secolo XIX. Saggio critico. *Ravenna:* E. Lavagna e figlio, 1924. 52 pp. L. 6.

Bernardino da Siena, Santo.—Le più belle pagine, scelte da P. Misciattelli. *Milano:* Fratelli Treves, 1924. xvi + 297 pp. (Le più belle pagine degli scrittori italiani, scelte da scrittori viventi, no. 22.)

Bertieri, A.—Notizie storiche della vita e delle opere del sac. Luigi Fiacchi detto il Clasio, pubblicate per la ricorrenza del 1° centenario della morte di lui. *Firenze:* Tip. T. Linari, 1924. 32 pp. L. 1.

Boccaccio, Giovanni. — Il Decamerone. *Milano:* A. Barion, 1924. 2 vols., 248, 200 pp. L. 4.

Brancoli, G.—Ada Negri. Conferenza. *Lucca:* Tip. Pacini, 1924. 35 pp. L. 3. (Edizioni Aurora.)

D'Azeglio, Massimo.—I miei ricordi. Edizione integra, a cura di G. Biagi. *Firenze:* G. C. Sansoni, 1924. xvi + 444 pp. L. 9.

De Amicis, Edmondo.—Cuore. Edited with direct-method exercises, notes, and vocabulary, by O. H. Moore and D. P. Rotunda. *Boston:* D. C. Heath and Co., 1925. x + 224 pp. $1.12.

De Robertis, G.—Poeti lirici dei secoli XVIII e XIX, con l'interpretazione di —. *Firenze:* F. Le Monnier, 1923. 242 pp. L. 10.

Farinelli, A.—Byron e il byronismo Sei discorsi. *Bologna:* N. Zanichelli, 1924. xi + 206 pp. L. 13.50.

Fassò, L.—Avventurieri della penna del Seicento: Gregorio Leti, Giovanni Gerolamo Arconati Lamberti, Tomaso Tomasi, Bernardo Guasconi. *Firenze:* F. Le Monnier, 1923. xv + 352 pp. L. 17.50.

Foscolo, Ugo.—Poesie, con prefazione e note di G. Bazzarin. *Padova:* Libr. Gregoriana, 1924. 148 pp. (Il Lauro: collana poetica, no. 3.)

Gargallo, Tommaso.—Poesie italiane e latine, per cura di Giovambattista Puccinelli. *Firenze:* Tip. Giuntina, 1924. xxxvii + 717 pp. L. 50. (Opere edite ed inedite, pubblicate da Filippo Francesco di Castel Lentini, II.)

Giorgi, E.—La poesia della nuova Italia. Introduzione e guida alla lettura dei poeti moderni. *Arezzo:* E. Sinatti, 1924. 68 pp. L. 2.50.

Giusti, Giuseppe.—Poesie edite ed ine-

dite. *Milano:* A. Barion, 1923. 192 pp. L. 2.

Leopardi, Giacomo.—Paralipomeni della Batracomiomachia. *Firenze:* F. Le Monnier, 1924. 134 pp. L. 4.

Lorenzetti, P.—Il canto XXIII del Paradiso, commentato alla Sala dantesca di Ravenna, XX maggio 1923. *Ravenna:* E. Lavagna e figlio, 1924. 36 pp.

Machiavelli, Niccolò.—Il principe. Introduzione e note di F. Chabod. *Torino:* Unione tipografico-editrice, 1924. xlvii + 136 pp. L. 6. (Collezione di classici italiani con note, XXXV.)

R., A.—Estudio crítico sobre la "Historia de Cristo" de Juan Papini. Panorama. *Maracaibo* (Venezuela): 1924. 34 pp.

Verrua, P.—Umanisti ed altri "studiosi viri" italiani e stranieri di qua e di là dalle Alpi e dal Mare. *Genève:* L. S. Olschki, 1924. 231 pp. L. 20. (Biblioteca dell' "Archivum Romanicum." Serie I: Storia, letteratura, paleografia, 3.)

Viviani, U. — Vita, opere, iconografia, bibliografia, vocabolario inedito delle voci aretine e libro inedito dei "Ricordi" di Francesco Redi. Parte I. *Arezzo:* U. Viviani, 1924. viii + 117 pp. L. 10. (Collana di pubblicazioni storiche e letterarie aretine, no. 9.)

SPANISH

Amunátegui Reyes, M. L.—Observaciones i enmiendas a un Diccionario, aplicables también a otros. Tomo I. *Santiago de Chile:* Impr. Universitaria, 1924. 341 pp.

Araya Bennett, F.—Nuestro Hispanismo. *Valparaíso (Chile):* Impr. "El Progreso Español," 1924. 48 pp. (Publicación del Centro Español.)

Bazán de Cámara, Rosa.—El Alma del Quijote. Prólogo de Adolfo Bonilla y San Martín. *Buenos Aires:* Talleres S. A. Casa, Jacobo Peuser, Ltda., 1924. 153 pp.

Cabeza de León, S.—Un episodio de la vida académica de don Domingo Fontán. *La Coruña:* Litografia e Imprenta Roel, 1924. 14 pp.

Dorado, C. M.—Segundas lecciones de español. *Boston:* Ginn and Co., 1925. x + 334 pp. $1.24.

Fernán Caballero.—Un servilón y un liberalito, o Tres almas de Diós. Edited with introduction, notes, direct-method exercises, and vocabulary, by Nina Lee Weisinger. *Philadelphia:* The John C. Winston Co., 1924. xxx + 245 pp. (The Winston Modern Language Series, E. B. de Sauzé, General Editor.)

Figarola-Caneda, D.—Centón epistolario de Domingo Delmonte, con un prefacio, anotaciones y una tabla alfabética por —. Tomo I: 1822-1832. *Habana:* Impr. "El Siglo XX," 1923. xvii + 188 pp.

Jústiz y del Valle, T. de.—Elogio del doctor Rafael Fernández de Castro y Castro, leído por — en la sesión solemne celebrada por la Academia de la Historia Habana, en la noche del 22 de junio de 1922. *Habana:* Impr. de "El Siglo XX," 1924. 51 pp.

M. Cora, L.—Conferencias, discursos y artículos literarios en controversia sobre temas sociales, políticos y filosóficos. *Santa Fe:* 1924. 143 pp.

Núñez, Ponte J. M. — Estudio crítico biográfico del doctor José Gregorio Hernández. *Caracas:* Tip. Vargas, 1924. 184 pp.

Rodríguez, P.—Evolución de las ideas sobre la decadencia española. *Madrid:* Imprenta Colonial, 1924. 75 pp.

Schmidt, Bertha.—Übersicht der spanischen Literatur. *Heidelberg:* J. Groos, 1924. viii + 210 pp. M. 4.

Vega, F. de la.—Apuntamientos literarios. *Cartagena de Indias (Colombia):* Tipografía Mogollón, 1924. xx + 251 pp.

Weems, R. B.—Un verano en España. A Spanish reader. *Boston:* D. C. Heath and Co., 1925. viii + 249 pp.

Zeballos, M.—Glosário ortográfico de la Lengua castellana. *Buenos Aires:* Talleres gráficos Cappellano Hermanos, 1924. 284 pp.

PORTUGUESE

Bell, A. F.—Diogo do Conto; Gaspar Corrêa. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924. 90 and 102 pp. $1.60.

Camões, Luis de.—Comédias. Edição organizada por P. Vievia. *São Paulo:* "Nova Era," 1923. 213 pp.

Duarte, C.—A graça portuguesa. Vulgarizações e comentários. *Lisboa:* A. M. Teixeira & Cia, 1923. 205 pp.

Fernandes Thomás, P.—Canções populares da Beira, acompanhadas de 58 melodias recolhidas directamente da tradição oral, con una introdução por J. Leite de Vasconcellos. *Coimbra:* 1923. xxxiii + 254 pp.

Figueiredo, F. de.—Historia da Litteratura classica. 2a epocha: 1580-1756; 3a epocha: 1756-1825. *Lisboa:* Portugalia, Liv. Ed., 1924. 221 pp. (Bibliotheca de Estudos Historicos Nacionaes, VIII.)

Magalhães Lima, J. de.—A Língua portuguesa e os seus mistérios. *Lisboa:* Aillaud e Bertrand, 1923. 145 pp.

Tavares, J. P.—Selecta de textos arcaicos e medievais, VI e VII classes dos liceus. *Porto:* 1923. 409 pp.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Arnold, Matthew.—Unpublished letters. *London:* Milford. 6s. 6d.

Bauer, R.—Die Iren . . . in der Darstellung von Edm. Spenser. Diss. *Halle:* 240 pp.

Borowski, Bruno.—Lautdubletten im Altenglischen. *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1924. 84 pp. M. 3.60.

Boynton, P. H.—Some Contemporary Americans. *Cambridge:* Harvard Univ. Press. $2.00.

Brennecke, Ernest.—The Life of Thomas Hardy. *New York:* Greenberg, 1925. $5.00.

—— Thomas Hardy's Universe. *London:* Fisher Unwin. 153 pp. 8s. 6d.

Büttner, Karl.—Die Sprache in Frances Burneys Evelina. *Giessen:* Engl. Sem. 36 pp.

Bullen, A. H.—Elizabethans. *London:* Chapman and Hall. 10s. 6d.

Butterfield, H.—The Historical Novel. An Essay. *Cambridge:* 5s.

Campbell, O. J. and Gingerich, S. F.—Critical Essays. *Ann Arbor, Mich.:* George Wahr. 100 pp. $1.0[illegible]

Carpenter, Edw. and Barnefield, Geo.—The Psychology of the Poet Shelley. *London:* Allen and Unwin, 1925. 127 pp. 4s. 6d.

Chancellor, E. B.—The London of Charles Dickens. *London:* Grant Richards. 327 pp.

Clare, John.—Madrigals and Chronicles. ed. Edm. Blunden. *London:* Beaumont Press. 102 pp. £1, 5s.

Craigie, W. A.—Easy Readings of Anglo-Saxon Prose. *London:* Hutchin. 77 pp. 2s. 6d.

Damon, S. F.—William Blake. *London:* Constable. xv + 487 pp. £2, 2s.

Dullemen, J. J. van.—Mrs. Gaskell, novellist en biographer. *Amsterdam:* 323 pp. Fl. 3.50.

Gay, J.—The Shepherd's Week. Ed. H. F. B. Brettsmith. *Oxford:* Blackwell. 4s. 6d.

Göritz, K.—Die Entstehung von Browning's "Christmas Eve." Diss. *Berlin:* 166 pp.

Gosse, Edmund.—Life of William Congreve. *London:* Heinemann. xi + 181 pp. 7s. 6d.

Hamilton, A. P.—Compounds of the word "cow." A study of semantics. Univ. of Pa. Diss. *Philadelphia:* 59 pp.

Harman, E. G.—The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia. *London:* C. Palmer. 12s. 6d.

Henson, H. H.—Byron: the Redes Lecture for 1924. *Cambridge:* Univ. Press. 57 pp. 2s. 6d.

Herford, C. H.—Dante and Milton. *New York:* Longmans. 47 pp.

Kelshall, J. M.—Robert Bridges, Poet Laureate. *London:* Scott. 93 pp. 2s. 6d.

Keynes, G.—A Bibliography of Sir Thomas Browne. *Cambridge:* Univ. Press. £2, 2s.

Lawrence, D. H.—Studies in Classic American Literature. *London:* Martin Secker. 175 pp. 10s. 6d.

MacDonald, George.—The Tragedie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke. A Study with the Text of the Folio of 1623. *London:* Allen and Unwin. xvi + 277 pp. 8s. 6d.

Mason, Augustus H.—Walter Savage Landor, poète lyrique. *Paris:* 237 pp. Fr. 10.

Moldauer, G.—Thomas Lovell Beddoes. *Wien:* W. Braumüller, 1924. x + 148 pp.

Mudge, I. G. and Sears, M. E.—A George Eliot Dictionary. *London:* Routledge. xlvii + 260 pp. 12s. 6d.

Murray, K.—Taine und die englische Romantik. *München:* Duncker and Humblot, 1924. vii + 78 pp. M. 2.50.

Newman, Frances.—The Short Story's Mutations: From Petronius to Paul Morand. *New York:* Huebsch and Co., 1925. $2.50.

Salt, H. S.—Percy Bysshe Shelley: Poet and Pioneer. *London:* Allen and Unwin. viii + 135 pp. 3s. 6d.

Saurat, Denis.—Milton, Man and Thinker. *New York:* Lincoln MacVeagh. $4.00.

—— Blake and Milton. *New York:* Lincoln MacVeagh. $2.00.

Spielmann, M. H.—The title-page of the first folio of Shakespeare's plays. *London:* Milford. 68 pp. 8s. 6d.

Stokes, F. G.—Dictionary of Characters and Proper Names in the Works of Shakespeare. *London:* Harrap. xv + 360 pp. 1s. 1d.

Vernon, F.—The Twentieth Century Theatre. *London:* Harrap. 159 pp. 5s.

Weiss, A.—Die Mundart im englischen Drama von 1642 bis 1800. *Giessen:* Engl. Sem. 86 pp.

Wilkinson, J. H.—Leeds Dialect Glossary and Lore. *Leeds:* Miles. xxi + 234 pp.

Williams, R. A.—The Finn Episode of Beowulf. *Cambridge:* Univ. Press. xii + 171 pp. 10s.

Williams, Stanley T.—Studies in Victorian Literature. *London:* Allen and Unwin, 1925. 299 pp. 12s. 6d.

Wilson, D. A.—Carlyle to the "French Revolution." *London:* K. Paul. 434 pp. 15s.

Yvon, P.—Horace Walpole as a Poet. *Paris:* 217 pp. Fr. 15.

GERMAN

Amelung, Heinz. — Goethe als Persönlichkeit. Berichte u. Briefe von Zeitgenossen ges. Bd. 3. [Goethe, Sämtl. Werke, Propyläen-Ausg. Erg. Bd. 3]. *Berlin:* Propyläen-Verlag 1925. v + 263 pp. 4°. M. 9.

Behrend, Fritz. — Aus Theodor Fontanes Werkstatt (zu Effi Briest). Mit e. Hs. Nachbildung. *Berlin:* H. Berthold, 1924. 43 pp. M. 8.

Bianchi, Lorenzo. — Studien zur Beurteilung des Abraham a Santa Clara. *Heidelberg:* Weiss, 1924. 62 pp. M. 1.50.

Errante, V.—Il mito di Faust dal personaggio storico al poema di Goethe. *Bologna:* Zanichelli, 1924. xi + 327 pp. L. 27.50.

Fontane, Theodor.—Briefe an seine Familie. 8.-10. Aufl. *Berlin:* S. Fischer, 1924. xii, 319, 348 pp.

—— Briefe an seine Freunde. 2. Aufl. 2 Bde. *Berlin:* S. Fischer, 1925. xii + 420; xvi + 499 pp.

Frey, Lina.—Adolf Frey. Sein Leben und Schaffen. Bd. 2. *Leipzig:* H. Haessel, 1925. 428 pp., Cloth M. 12.

Gillischewski, Eva.—Das Schicksalsproblem bei Ricarda Huch im Zusammenhang ihrer Weltanschauung. [Germ. Studien, H. 35]. *Berlin:* Ebering, 1925. iv + 148 pp. M. 4.80.

Graap, P. G.—Richard Wagners dramatischer Entwurf "Jesus von Nazareth." Entstehungsgeschichte u. Versuch einer kurzen Würdigung. Diss. *Marburg:* 1924. 93 pp.

Griesser, L. — Nietzsche und Wagner. Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte und Psychologie ihrer Freundschaft. *Wien:* Hölder, 1924. M. 14.

Haebler, Konrad. — Die deutschen Buchdrucker des 15. Jhs. im Auslande. *München:* J. Rosenthal, 1924. vii + 315 pp., 26 plates. M. 60.

Hammarström, Emil.—Zur Stellung des Verbums in der deutschen Sprache. Studien in volkstüml. Literatur und Urkundensprache der Übergangszeit vom Mhd. zum Nhd. *Lund:* 1924. iv + 259 pp.

Hausegger, S. v. — Briefwechsel zwischen Peter Rosegger u. Friedr. v. Hausegger. *Leipzig:* Staackmann, 1924. 216 pp. M. 5.

Hohenemser, Paul. — Flugschriftensammlung Gustav Freytag. Stadtbibliothek Frankfurt a. M. *Frankfurt a. M.:* Societätsdruckerei, 1925. xix + 512 pp. 4°. Cloth, M. 40.

Jahrbuch der Sammlung Kippenberg. Bd. 4. 1924. *Leipzig:* Insel-Verlag, [1924]. 333 pp. Cloth, M. 5.

Hölderlin.—Werke. Hrsg. v. H. Brandenburg. Krit. durchges. u. erl. Ausg. 2 Bde. *Leipzig:* Bibliogr. Institut [1924]. 526; 543 pp.

Littmann, Enno. — Morgenländische Wörter im Deutschen. 2., verm. u. verb. Aufl. nebst e. Anh. über die amerikanischen Wörter. *Tübingen:* Mohr, 1924. xii + 163 pp. Cloth, M. 5.

Pniower, Otto. — Goethe in Berlin und Potsdam. *Berlin:* Mittler & Sohn, 1925. ix + 103 pp., 4°. Bound, M. 8.

Schröder, Edward.—Die deutsche Marienlegende vom Bischof Bonus [Nachr. v. d. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Kl. Jg. 75, H. 1, S. 1-12]. *Göttingen:* 1924.

Tarneller, Josef.—Die Hofnamen im Untern Eisacktal. 3. [Schluss.] [S.-A. aus Archiv f. österr. Gesch. Bd. 110, Hälfte 1]. *Wien:* Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1924. 162 pp. M. 1.80.

Teuthonista. Zeitschrift für deutsche Dialektforschung u. Sprachgeschichte. Hrsg. v. Herm. Teuchert. Jg. 1, 1924/25. H. 1. Okt. *Bonn:* K. Schroeder (1924). 80 pp. 4 plates. M. 12 per year.

Völlick, B.—Über Lenaus mütterliche Vorfahren. (Mit 1 Ahnentafel). *Budapest:* Pester Buchdruckerei, 1925. 11 pp. M. 2.

Wolff, Eugen. — Entwicklungsgeschichtliche Goethe-Kritik. *Oldenburg:* Schulze, 1925. 59 pp. M. 1.

FRENCH

Dubrule, N. and Manser, H. E. — French Composition and Pronunciation Exercises. *New York:* Ginn and Co., 1925. vii + 404 pp. $1.40.

Ettmayer, Karl. — Ueber das Wesen der Dialektbildung, erläutert an den Dialekten Frankreichs. *Wien:* Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1924. 57 pp. 4°. M. 1. (Akademie d. Wiss. in Wien. Phil.-hist. Kl. Denkschriften Bd. 66, Abh. 3.)

Faÿ, Bernard.—L'Esprit révolutionnaire en France et aux Etats-Unis à la fin du dix-huitième siècle. *Paris:* Champion, 1925. 378 pp.

France, A. — La comédie de celui qui épousa une femme muette, ed. by L. Cardon. *New York:* Holt and Co., 1924. iv + 132 pp.

Glossaire des Patois de la Suisse Romande. Elaboré avec le concours de nombreux auxiliaires et rédigé par L. Gauchat, J. Jeanjaquet, E. Tappolet, avec la collaboration de E. Muret. *Neuchatel:* Victor Attinger, 1924. Fascicule 1: *a-abord.* 6 fr.

Parker, C. S. — Favorite French Stories. *New York:* Allyn and Bacon, 1925. 80 cts. vi + 323 pp.

Rambaud, A.—Extraits de l'histoire de la civilisation française, ed. by J. Seronde. *New York:* Holt and Co. v + 283 pp.

Roth, Suzanne. — Contes faciles. *New York:* Allyn and Bacon, 1925. 80 cts. viii + 235 pp.

Schmidt, Otto.—Methodik des franz. Unterrichts. Für die Praxis dargestellt. *Berlin:* Ferd. Dümmler, 1924. 92 pp.

Strohmeyer, Fritz.—Der Stil der französischen Sprache. 2., verm. u. verb. Aufl. *Berlin:* Weidmann, 1924. xxiv + 364 pp. M. 10.

Valkhoff, P.—De strijd tegen de romantik in het tegenwoordige Frankrijk. Rede. *Amersfoort:* Valkhoff. 32 pp. Fl. .80.

Valeri, D.—Poeti francesi del nostro tempo. (Jammes, Gide, Guérin, Fort, Philippe.) *Piacenza:* Soc. tip. ed. Porta, 1924. 118 pp. L. 5.

ITALIAN

Arcudi, G.—Manzoni. Conférence. *Torino:* Libr. ed. "Il Risveglio" (Foà), 1924. 32 pp.

Barbiera, R.—Venezia nel canto de' suoi poeti, scelti e illustrati da —; con pagine di musica popolare. *Milano:* Fratelli Treves, 1925. 321 pp. L. 13.20.

Bocchi, A.—L'umor faceto di fra Salimbene da Parma. *Parma:* Tip. Donati, 1924. 25 pp.

Boiardo, Matteo Maria. — Le più belle pagine, scelte da A. Panzini. *Milano:* Fratelli Treves, 1924. xix + 290 pp. (Le più belle pagine degli scrittori italiani, scelte da scrittori viventi, no. 21.)

D'Azeglio, Massimo. — I miei ricordi. *Firenze:* A. Salani, 1924. 644 pp. L. 5.75. (Collezione Salani: I classici, edizione Florentia, no. 20.)

Ferrari, D.—Commento delle Odi barbare di Giosuè Carducci. Libro II. Seconda edizione. *Bologna:* N. Zanichelli, 1924. vi + 194 pp. L. 8.50.

Fucini, R.—Novelle e poesie. Edited by H. Furst. *Chicago:* The University of Chicago Press, 1924. vii + 171 pp. $1.40. (The University of Chicago Italian Series.)

Giusti, Giuseppe.—Prose, con prefazione di Ferdinando Martini. *Firenze:* G. Barbèra, 1924. xxiii + 576 pp. L. 8. (Collezione Diamante.)

Lambruschini-Gioberti.—Carteggio, a cura di A. Gambaro. *Firenze:* A. Vallecchi, 1924. 37 pp. (Repr. fr. "Levana.")

Leopardi, Giacomo.—Poesie. Nuova edizione riveduta e corretta. *Milano:* A. Barion, 1923. 192 pp. L. 2.

Manzoni, Alessandro. — I promessi sposi. Storia milanese del sec. XVII, con introduzione di V. Arangio Ruiz. *Lanciano:* G. Carabba, 1924. xxxi + 607 pp. L. 6.

—— Le tragedie, gli inni sacri, le odi nella forma definitiva e negli abbozzi, con le varianti delle diverse edizioni e con gli scritti illustrativi dell' autore, a cura di M. Scherillo. Precede un discorso sul decennio dell'operosità poetica del Manzoni. Terza edizione accresciuta. *Milano:* U. Hoepli, 1924. clxxviii + 559 pp. L. 26. (Opere di A. Manzoni, edizione Hoepli, vol. III.)

Metastasio, Pietro.—La morte di Abele; Giuseppe riconosciuto; canzonette a Nice. In appendice: G. Baretti, Opere drammatiche dell' ab. Pietro Metastasio poeta cesareo. *Roma:* Casa ed. Leonardo da Vinci, 1924. 90 pp. L. 2.80. (Universitas scriptorum, no. 5.)

Parini, Giuseppe. — Le più belle pagine, scelte da C. Linati. *Milano:* Fratelli Treves, 1924. viii + 283 pp. (Le più belle pagine degli scrittori italiani, scelte da scrittori viventi, no. 20.)

Piancastelli, C. — I Promessi Sposi nella Romagna e la Romagna nei Promessi Sposi. *Bologna:* Stab. Poligrafici riuniti, 1924. 121 pp.

Piccoli, V.—Leopardi. *Milano:* Tip. Terragni e Calegari, 1924. 199 pp. L. 6. (Edizioni Alpes.)

Romagnoli, E.—In platea. Serie prima: critiche drammatiche dell' anno 1923. *Bologna:* N. Zanichelli, 1924. 288 pp. L. 15.

Ronzy, P. — Un humaniste italianisant: Papire Masson (1544-1611). *Paris:* Librairie ancienne Edouard Champion, 1924. xxvii + 691 pp. Fr. 70. (Bibliothèque de l'Institut français de Naples [Université de Grenoble]. Première série. Tome I.)

—— Bibliographie critique des oeuvres imprimées et manuscrites de Papire Masson (1544-1611). *Paris:* Librairie ancienne Edouard Champion, 1924. xiv + 159 pp. (Bibliothèque de l'Institut français de Naples [Université de Grenoble]. Première série. Tome II.)

Russo, L. L. — Ugo Ricci. *Napoli:* G. Casella, 1924. 124 pp. L. 7. (Contemporanei, III.)

Santanera, A.—L'apparition de Béatrice. Commentaire au XXXe chant du Purgatoire. *Bruxelles:* M. Lamertin, 1924. 58 pp.

Virgilio. — Eneide, tradotta da Annibal Caro. *Firenze:* A. Salani, 1923. 463 pp. L. 5.75. (I classici, edizione Florentia, no. 15.)

SPANISH

Barja, C.—Literatura española. Libros y autores modernos. *New York:* G. E. Stechert and Co., 1924. xxvi + 644 pp.

Castro Guisasola, F.—Observaciones sobre las fuentes literarias de "La Celestina."

Madrid: Jiménez y Molina, 1924. 194 pp. 10 pes. (Junta para ampliación de estudios. Centro de estudios históricos. "Revista de filología española." Anejo V.)

Clemente Romeo, E.—Canciones humanas. Edición cuidada por —. *Bilbao:* Editorial Vasca, 1923. 230 pp.

Dobranich, H. H.—Entre libros y papeles. Artículos y estudios literarios. *Buenos Aires:* Editorial "Ego," 1924. 212 pp.

Furt, J. M.—Cancionero popular ríoplatense. Tomo I. *Buenos Aires:* Lib. "La Facultad," 1923.

Lugan, A.—El gran poeta del siglo de oro español. Fray Luis de Léon. *New York:* Instituto de las Españas en los Estados Unidos, 1924. 160 pp. $1.00.

M. Cora, L.—Arpegios crepusculares. *Rosario:* Comp. gen. de artes gráficas, 1922. 260 pp.

Ojeda V., A.—Transparencias. *Quito (Ecuador):* Imprenta y Encuadernación de Julio Sáenz R., 1924. 214 pp.

Peers, E. A.—Angel de Saavedra, Duque de Rivas. A critical study. *New York, Paris:* 1923. 600 pp. (Repr. fr. the "Revue Hispanique," LVIII.)

Poema de mio Cid. Estratti ordinati da C. De Lollis. *Roma:* Libreria di Scienze e lettere, 1924. 43 pp. (Biblioteca neolatina, a cura di C. De Lollis, I.)

Quevedo.—Poesías atrevidas. *Barcelona:* B. Bauzá, 1924. 234 pp. 2 pes. (Colección Apolo.)

Rubio, D.—¿Hay una filosofía en el Quijote? *Nueva York:* Instituto de las Españas en los Estados Unidos, 1924. 167 pp.

Starkie, W.—Jacinto Benavente. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924. 218 pp. $3.50.

Valverde y Maruri, A. L.—Elogio del licenciado José de Armas y Cárdenas (Justo de Lara), leído por — en la sesión solemne celebrada por la Academia de la Historia, de La Habana, en la noche del 28 de diciembre de 1923. *Habana:* Impr. "El Siglo XX," 1923. 225 pp.

Zeballos, M.—Eutrapelias lingüísticas. *Buenos Aires:* Talleres gráficos Cappellano Hermanos, 1923. 20 pp.

CATALAN

Amades, J., i Roig, E.—Vocabulari de l'art de la navegació i la pesca. *Barcelona:* Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 1924. 116 pp. 10 pes. ("Butlletí de dialectologia catalana," XII.)

Analecta Montserratensia. Volum IV. Anys 1920-21. *Montserrat:* Abadia de Montserrat, 1922. 344 + 81 pp. 25 pes.

Costumari Català. Vol. I: Usos i costums de bon pagès sobre boscos i arbredes. Vol. II: Costums sobre termenals, camins i aigües en terres de pagès. *Barcelona:* Mancomunitat de Catalunya, 1921. 192, 135 pp.

Griera, A.—Atlas lingüístic de Catalunya. Vol. I: Abans d'ahir-avui. *Montserrat:* Imp. de l'Abadia, 1923. Fol., 187 mapas. (Institut d'Estudis Catalans.)

Llul, Ramón.—Arbre de Sciencia escrit a la ciutat de Roma l'any MCClxxxxv. Transcrició directa amb facsimils, introducció i mostres d'escriptura dels mes vells manuscrits per Moss. Salvador Galmés. Tomo II. *Palma de Mallorca:* Imp. de Amengual y Muntaner, 1923. viii + 461 pp.

Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm.—Das Katalanische. Seine Stellung zum Spanischen und Provenzalischen sprachwissenschaftlich und historisch dargestellt. *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1925. xii + 191 pp. M. 6.50. (Samml. roman. Elementar- und Handbücher, V. Reihe: Unters. u. Texte, 7. Bd.)

Par y Tusquets, A.—Notes lingüístiques y d'estil sobre les inscripcions y cartes de Catalunya anteriors als segle XIVe. *Barcelona:* Impremta de la Casa de Caritat, 1924. 70 pp. (Discurs llegits en la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona en la solemnial recepció pública de D. A. Par y Tusquets el dia 30 de novembre de 1924.)

GENERAL

Aramburo, M.—Filosofía del derecho. Tomo primero. *Nueva York:* Instituto de las Españas en los Estados Unidos, 1925. 522 pp. $3.00.

Arnim, H. v.—Die drei aristotelischen Ethiken. [Akad. d. Wiss. in Wien. Philos.-hist. Kl. Sitzungsber. Bd. 202, Abh. 2]. *Wien:* Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1924. 142 pp. M. 4.50.

Boillot, F.—The Methodical Study of Literature. *Paris:* 152 pp. Fr. 12.

Gemoll, Wilh.—Das Apophthegma. Literarhist. Studien. *Wien:* Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1924. viii + 178 pp. M. 5.60.

Moraes, W. de.—Relance da historia do Japão. *Porto:* Edição de Marames, 1924. 305 pp.

Schnasz, Franz.—Henrik Ibsen. Sein Wesen u. Werk, Denken u. Dichten. *Langensalza:* J. Beltz, 1925. 107 pp. M. 3.

Olrik, Axel.—Nordisches Geistesleben in heidnischer und frühchristlicher Zeit (Nordisk Aandsliv i Vikingetid og tidlig Middelalder). Übertr. v. Wilh. Ranisch. 2. unveränd. Aufl. [Germ. Bibl. Abt. 1, Reihe 5, Bd. 1]. *Heidelberg:* Winter, 1925. xiii + 230 pp. M 5.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Allerton, Margaret. — Origins of Poe's Critical Theory. *Iowa City:* University of Iowa: Humanistic Studies, 1925.

Allrich, Hermann.—Defoe's Robinson Crusoe. Die Geschichte eines Weltbuches. *Leipzig:* D. R. Reisland, 1924.

Austin, Walter.—William Austin the creator of Peter Rugg. *Boston:* Marshall Jones Co., 1925.

Barrow, Sarah F. and Hulme, W. H.—The Medieval Religious Plays 'Antichrist' and 'Adam.' Translated, with an Introduction. *Cleveland:* Western Reserve University Bulletin, XXVIII, No. 8.

Boswell.—Boswell's Note Book 1776-1777, now first published from the unique original in the collection of R. B. Adam. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1925. $1.20.

Bruce, Harold.—William Blake in This World. *New York:* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1925. $3.00.

Camp, Charles W.—The Artisan in Elizabethan Literature. *New York:* Columbia University Press, 1924. $2.00.

Chaucer.—The Poetical Works of Geoffrey Chaucer. From the text of Professor Skeat. Vol. III: The Canterbury Tales. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1925. 80 cts.

Childers, J. S.—The Lives and Works of the Uneducated Poets, by Robert Southey. *New York:* Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1925. $1.20.

Clark, A. F. B.—Boileau and the French Classical Critics in England (1660-1830). *Paris:* Edouard Champion, 1925. 60 fr.

Clubb, Merrel Dare.—Christ and Satan: an Old English Poem. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Glossary. [Yale Studies in English, LXX.] *New Haven:* Yale University Press, 1925.

Coffman, George R.—A Book of Modern Plays. *New York and Chicago:* Scott, Foresman & Co., 1925.

De Froe, A. — Laurence Sterne and his Novels studied in the light of Modern Psychology. *Groningen:* P. Noordhoff, 1925.

De Maar, Harko G.—A History of Modern English Romanticism. Vol. I: Elizabethan and Modern Romanticism in the Eighteenth Century. *London and New York:* Oxford University Press, 1925. 10 sh. 6 d.

De Witt, M. E. — Euphon-English and World-Standard English in America. *New York:* E. P. Dutton & Co., 1925. $1.20.

Dickinson, Thomas H., and Crawford, Jack R. — Contemporary Plays. Sixteen Plays from the Recent Drama of England and America. *Boston:* Houghton Mifflin Co., 1925. $3.50.

Dottin, Paul.—Daniel De Foe et ses Romans. *Oxford:* University Press, 1924. 3 vols. 21 sh.

Fowler, F. G. and Fowler, H. W.—The Pocket Oxford Dictionary. *Oxford and New York:* Oxford University Press, 1925. $1.50.

Garrod, H. W.—Coleridge, Prose and Poetry, with Essays by Hazlitt, Jeffrey, De Quincey, Carlyle and Others. *Oxford and New York:* Clarendon Press, 1925. $1.20.

Gingerich, Solomon Francis.—Essays in the Romantic Poets. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1924.

Gordon, G. S. and Cavenaugh, F. S.—Scott: A Legend of Montrose. Edited with Introduction and Notes. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1925. $1.20.

Grant, Mary A.—The Ancient Rhetorical Theories of the Laughable. *Madison:* University of Wisconsin, 1924.

Grimball, Elizabeth G. and Wells, Rhea.—Costuming a Play. *New York:* The Century Co., 1925. $3.00.

Griston, Harris Jay.—Shaking the Dust from Shakespeare. An authentic renovation of the Merchant of Venice. Second Impression. *New York:* Cosmopolis Press, 1924.

Haines, C. M.—Shakespeare in France. Criticism. Voltaire to Victor Hugo. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1925. $3.50.

Heller, Otto.—Robert Burns: A revaluation; Linguistry and Linguistics in Graduate Schools. [Reprinted from Washington University Studies, XII.]

Herford, C. H. and Simpson, Percy.—Ben Jonson. Vols. I and II: The Man and his Work. *Oxford:* Clarendon Press, 1925.

Hotson, J. Leslie.—The Death of Christopher Marlowe. *Cambridge:* Harvard University Press, 1925.

Kaye, F. B.—The Fable of the Bees: or, Private Vices, Public Benefits. With a Commentary Critical, Historical and Explanatory. 2 vols. *Oxford:* Clarendon Press, 1925.

Kittredge, George Lyman.—Sir Thomas Malory. *Barnstable:* Privately Printed, 1925. 12 pp.

Kruisinga, E.—A Handbook of Present-Day English. In Four Parts. Fourth Edition. *Utrecht:* Kemink en Zoon, 1925.

van Langenhove, George Ch.—On the Origins of the Gerund in English Phonology. *Paris:* E. Champion, 1925.

Lee, Sir Sidney and Boas, F. S.—The Year's Work in English Studies, Volume IV, 1923. *Oxford and London:* Oxford University Press, 1925.

Loomis, Roger S. — Freshman Readings. *Boston:* Houghton Mifflin Co., 1925.

Mackinnon, Flora Isabel.—Philosophical Writings of Henry More. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1925. $3.50.

Manwaring, Elizabeth Wheeler.—Italian Landscape in Eighteenth Century England. [The Wellesley Semi-Centennial Series.] *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1925. $3.00.

Meadowcroft, Charles W.—The Place of Eden Phillpotts in English Peasant Drama. *Philadelphia:* University of Pennsylvania, 1925.

Milford, H. S.—Selected English Short Stories (XIX and XX Centuries). Edited with notes. Second Series. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1925. $1.00.

Moore, Samuel. — Historical Outlines of English Phonology and Morphology: Middle English and Modern English. *Ann Arbor:* George Wahr, 1925.

Nag, U. C.—A Midsummer Night's Dream. A study in dramatic technique. [Dacca University Bulletins, No. 2.] *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1925. 35 cts.

Parker, Joan.—Travel in England in the Seventeenth Century. *London:* Humphrey Milford, 1925.

Partridge, Eric.—The Poems of Cuthbert Shaw and Thomas Russell. *London:* Dulau & Co., 1925.

Pompen, Fr. Aurelius.—The English Versions of the Ship of Fools. A contribution to the history of the Early French Renaissance in England. With Plates. *New York:* Longmans, Green & Co., 1925. $7.50.

Praz, Mario.—Secentismo e marinismo in Inghilterra. *Firenze:* La Voce, 1925.

Renwick, W. L.—Edmund Spenser: an Essay on Renaissance Poetry. *London:* Edward Arnold & Co., *New York:* Longmans, Green & Co., 1925. $3.75.

Rypens, Stanley. — Three Old English Prose Texts in MS. Cotton Vitellius A XV. Edited with an Introduction and Glossarial Index. *London:* Early English Text Society; *Oxford and New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924. $10.00.

Scarborough, Dorothy.—On the Trail of Negro Folk-Songs. *Cambridge:* Harvard University Press, 1925. $3.50.

Schelling, Felix E. — Elizabethan Playwrights: A Short History of the English Drama from Medieval Times to the Closing of the Theaters in 1642. *New York:* Harper & Brothers, 1925.

Shafer, Robert.—From Beowulf to Hardy. *New York:* Doubleday, Page & Co., 1925. 2 vols. $3.00 each.

Simpson, Evelyn M.—A Study of the Prose Works of John Donne. *Oxford and New York:* Oxford University Press, 1925. $5.00.

Smith, David Nichol. — Dryden: Poetry and Prose, with Essays by Congreve, Johnson, Scott and Others. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1925. $1.20.

Smith, John Harrington.—Dryden's Critical Temper. [Reprinted from Washington University Studies, XII.]

Sprau, George.—The Meaning of Literature. *New York:* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925. $1.40.

Sykes, H. Dugdale.—Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama. A series of studies dealing with the authorship of Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Plays. *London and New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924.

Taylor, George Coffin. — Shakespeare's Debt to Montaigne. *Cambridge:* Harvard University Press, 1925.

Tinker, Chauncey Brewster.—Letters of James Boswell, collected and edited in two volumes. *London and New York:* Clarendon Press, 1925. $10.00.

Tolkien, J. R. R. and Gordon, E. V.—Sir Gawain and The Green Knight. Edited. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1925. $2.50.

Weigand, Herman J.—The Modern Ibsen. An Interpretation. *New York:* Henry Holt & Co., 1925. $3.75.

Westergaard, Elizabeth.—Studies in Prefixes and Suffixes in Middle Scottish. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924. 135 pp. $4.20.

GERMAN

Bagster-Collins, E. W.—A First German Reader. *New York:* Holt, 1925. 164 pp.

Bauer, Erika.—Die Morunger Mundart. Laut- und Formenlehre nebst Sprachproben. Ein Beitr. zur nordfriesischen Dialektforschung. [Germ. Bibl. 1. Abt., 1. Reihe: Grammatiken, 14.] *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1925. xiv + 120 pp. M. 6.50.

Bulthaupt, Heinr. — Dramaturgie des Schauspiels. Bd. 1. Lessing, Goethe, Schiller, Kleist. 14. Aufl. *Oldenburg:* Schulze, 1924. xxiv + 572 pp., cloth, M. 8.

Faesi, Robert.—Conrad Ferdinand Meyer. 2. Aufl. [Die Schweiz im deutschen Geistesleben. 36.] *Leipzig:* H. Haessel, 1925. 147 pp. Boards, M. 2.

Flaischlen, Caesar. — Das Buch unserer deutschen Dichtung. 4 Bde., umfassend die

Zeit von 1500-1870. Bd. 1: 1500-1800. *Königstein im T.:* Andermann, 1925. viii + 852 pp., 40 plates, 4°.

Graff, Sigmund, u. Walter Bormann.—Schwere Brocken. 1000 Worte Front-Deutsch. *Leipzig:* B. Hermann & G. E. Schulze, 1925. 126 pp. M. 2.

Jellinghaus, H. — Die westfälischen Ortsnamen nach ihren Grundwörtern. 3. verm. Ausg. *Osnabrück:* F. Schöningh, 1923. 191 pp. M. 5.

Jenal, Emil.—Johann Gaudenz von Salis-Seewis und die eidgenössische Wiedergeburt. *Chur:* Schuler, 1924. 123 pp.

Karg-Gasterstädt, Elisabeth. — Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Parzival. [Sächs. Forschungsinstitute in Leipzig, I, Hft. 2]. *Halle:* Max Niemeyer, 1925. 11 + 157 pp., 11 tables. M. 9.

Keller, Gottfried. — Der grüne Heinrich. Roman. Erster Teil. Edited by Barker Fairley. *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press, 1925. 240 pp. $2.00.

Kleist-Gesellschaft.—Schriften der Kleist-Gesellschaft. Band 3 u. 4: Jahrbuch 1923 und 1924, hrsg. von G. Minde-Pouet u. J. Petersen. *Berlin:* Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1925. 230 pp.

Knowles, Isobel A. — Vom Fëgfûr, By Ægidius Tschudi. Edited from the original MS. in the Abbey Archives of St. Gall with a grammatical commentary, notes and a glossary. [*Glasgow:* 1924]. 252 pp.

Konrad von Würzburg. — Kleinere Dichtungen. Hrsg. v. Edward Schröder. 2. Der Schwanritter. Das Turnier von Nantes. *Berlin:* Weidmann, 1925. xii + 76 pp. M. 2.

Köster, Albert. — Faust. Eine Weltdichtung. *München:* Verl. f. Kulturpolitik, 1924. 44 pp.

Lasch, Agathe. — Aus alten niederdeutschen Stadtbüchern. Ein mittelniederdeutsches Lesebuch. [Hamburgische Texte u. Untersuchungen zur deu. Phil. Reihe I, 2]. *Dortmund:* F. W. Ruhfus, 1925. xi + 165 pp.

Lussky, Alfred Edwin.—Tieck's Approach to Romanticism. Univ. of Mich. Diss. *Borna-Leipzig:* Robert Noske, 1925. x + 119 pp.

Palitzsch, Otto Alfred. — Erlebnisgehalt und Formproblem in Friedrich Maximilian Klingers Jugenddramen. [Hamb. Texte u. Unters. z. deu. Phil. Reihe II, 2]. *Dortmund:* F. W. Ruhfus, 1925. viii + 73 pp.

Petsch, Robert.—Gehalt und Form. Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur Literaturwissenschaft u. zur allgem. Geistesgeschichte. [Hamb. Texte u. Unters. zur deu. Phil. Reihe II, 1]. *Dortmund:* F. W. Ruhfus, 1925. 572 pp.

Pfeil, Victoria. — Lessing und die Schauspielkunst. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der unmittelbaren Bühnenanweisung. Diss. *Giessen:* 1924. 70 pp.

Reuter, Fritz.—Werke, hrsg. v. W. Seelmann. Krit. durchges. u. erl. Ausg. 7 Bde. *Leipzig:* Bibliogr. Institut [1924].

Rost, Bernhard. — Der Dichter Ludwig Ganghofer und seine Vaterstadt Kaufbeuren. *Kaufbeuren:* Vereinigte Kunstanstalten, 1925. 63 pp. Boards, M. 1.20.

Sarauw, Chr. — Zur Faustchronologie. [Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser X, 2]. *Copenhagen:* A. F. Høst & Søn, 1925. 89 pp.

Saverio, Emil Francis.—The Musical Element in the Viennese Volksstück and in the Dramas of Grillparzer. Univ. of Texas Diss. *Richmond, Va.:* 1925. 80 pp.

Schauer, Hans.—Das deutsche Drama seit der Renaissance u. d. Reformation [Deutschkundliche Bücherei]. *Leipzig:* Quelle & Meyer, 1925. 55 pp.

Schulze, Otto.—Die Familiennamen der Bürgermatrikel der Immediat-Stadt Haldensleben. Tl. 1. *Neuhaldensleben:* "Wochenblatt," 1924. 80 pp. M. 1.75.

Selka, Alfred. — Rudolf Baumbach. Ein Lebensbild. *Meiningen:* Keyszner'sche Hofbuchdr., 1924. 131 pp. Bound, M. 5.50.

Stefansky, Georg.—Das hellenisch-deutsche Weltbild. Einleitung in die Lebensgeschichte Schellings. *Bonn:* Friedrich Cohen, 1925. 226 pp. M. 6.50.

Sturmfels, Wilh. — Die Ortsnamen des Kreises Biedenkopf. *Rüsselsheim a. M.:* Selbstverlag, 1924. 14 pp. M. 1.

Teweles, Heinr.—Goethe und die Juden. *Hamburg:* W. Gente, 1925. 205 pp. Bound, M. 3.50.

Tille, Edda.—Zur Sprache der Urkunden des Herzogtums Geldern. [Rhein. Beiträge u. Hülfsbücher, Bd. 7.] *Bonn:* K. Schroeder, 1925. x + 207 pp. 4°. M. 7.50.

Trendelenburg, A. — Rembrandts Faust und Goethe. Mit 2 Tafeln. *Berlin:* W. Grützmacher, 1925. 16 pp. 60 Pf.

Vos, Bert J., and Barba, Preston A.—German Lyrics and Ballads from Klopstock to Modern Times. *New York:* Henry Holt & Co., 1925. xviii + 526 pp.

Weltliteratur der Gegenwart. Deutschland. Tl. 1. 2. In Verbindung mit E. Blass, E. Drahn, G. K. Brand, P. Fechter, F. Gottfurcht, A. Knoblauch, M. Krell, J. Nohl, A. Schirokauer u. L. Weltmann hrsg. v. Ludwig Marcuse. *Berlin:* Schneider, 1924. xv + 464; vii + 288 pp., 4°. Bound, M. 30.

Weltzien, Otto. — Der Rosenjäger. Ein Lons-Buch. *Berlin:* Deutsche Landbuchhandlung, 1925. v + 163 pp. Cloth, M. 3.50.

Williams, Charles Allyn.—Oriental Affinities of the Legend of the Hairy Anchorite. Pt. I: Pre-Christian. [Univ. of Illinois Studies in Lang. and Lit. x, 2]. *Urbana:* 1925, 56 pp. $1.00.

Witkop, Philipp.—Die deutschen Lyriker von Luther bis Nietzsche. Bd. 1. Von Luther bis Hölderlin. 3. veränd. Aufl. *Leipzig:* Teubner, 1925. vii + 306 pp. Cloth, M. 10.

FRENCH

Arnould, L.—La Terre de France chez La Fontaine. *Tours:* Mame, 1925. 392 pp.

Baldensperger, F.—Sensibilité musicale et romantisme. *Paris:* Presses fr., 1925. 134 pp.

Bodel, Jean.—Le Jeu de Saint Nicolas, édité par Alfred Jeanroy. (Classiques français du moyen âge, 48.) *Paris:* E. Champion, 1925. xvi + 93 pp. 5 fr.

Boylesve.—La Becquée, ed. by A. Schaffer. *New York:* Knopf, 1925. x + 228 pp.

Cardon, L.—Première Année Moderne. *New York:* Scribner, 1925. xxxviii + 324 pp. $1.40.

Catalogue général des livres impr. de la Bibl. nat. T. 83 et 84. Koropatnicki-Lackowitz. *Paris:* Impr. nat., 1925.

Caudel, M.—Pour les étudiants étrangers en France, notes, conseils, lectures. *Paris:* Plon, 1925. x + 237 pp. Fr. 7.50.

Coindreau et Lowe.—A French Composition Book, ill. by J. Robles. *New York:* Holt, 1925. x + 361 pp.

Fage, A.—Anthologie des Conteurs d'Aujourd'hui. *Paris:* Delagrave, 1924. 480 pp.

Gennrich, F. — Die altfrz. Rotrouenge. Literarhistorisch-musikwissenschaftliche Studie II. *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1925. 84 pp. M. 7.

Giraud, V.—Passions et romans d'autrefois. *Paris:* Champion, 1925. 249 pp. Fr. 15.

Greenfield and Babson.—Industrial and scientific French. *Boston:* Ginn, 1925. vi + 327 pp.

Guillet, C. — An oral French Grammar. *Alfred, N. Y.:* University Press, 1925. 309 pp.

Hunter, A. C. — J.-B.-A. Suard. [Diss.] *Paris:* Champion, 1925. vii + 195 pp.

Labiche.—Le Voyage de M. Perrichon, ed. by R. E. House and C. E. Young. *Boston:* Heath, 1925. v + 156 pp. 80 cts.

Mairet, J.—Chryséide et Arimand, éd. critique par H. Carrington Lancaster et collaborateurs. *Baltimore:* Johns Hopkins Press, 1925. 174 pp. $1.25. [Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages.]

Martin, M. — Un aventurier intellectuel sous la restauration et la monarchie de Juillet: le docteur Koreff. *Paris:* Champion, 1925. 169 pp.

Matisse, G.—Paris, centre de culture intellectuelle, ed. by L. Cardon. *New York:* Holt, 1925. xii + 190 pp.

Molière.—Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme, ed. by T. E. Oliver. *Boston:* Ginn, 1925. xxxv + 188 pp.

Moore, O. H. and Fouré, R.—A French Reader. *Boston:* Ginn, 1925. iv + 197 pp. 80 cts.

Mystère d'Adam, le, éd. et trad. par H. Chamard. *Paris:* Colin, 1925. xii + 101 pp.

Petersen, Holger (ed.).—Deux versions de la Vie de Sainte Eustache en vers français du moyen âge. (Extrait des Mémoires de la Société néo-philologique de Helsingfors.) *Helsingfors:* Soc. de litt. finnoise, 1925. Pp. 53-241.

Rohlfs, G. (ed.).—Sechs altfrz. Fablels. (Sammlung romanischer Übungstexte, 1. Band.) *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1925. x + 51 pp. M. 1.60.

Rousseau.—La Nouvelle Héloise, pub. par D. Mornet. T. I. *Paris:* Hachette, 1925. 396 pp. (Les grands écrivains de la France, 2e série.)

Schweinitz, M. de.—Les épitaphes de Ronsard. [Diss.] *Paris:* Presses Univ., 1925. xvi + 189 pp.

Stewart, C.—Rules of order for the French club. *New York:* Oxford Press, 1925. 24 pp. 45 cts.

Van der Meulen.—L'Idéalisme de Villiers de l'Isle-Adam. [Amsterdam Diss.] *Amsterdam:* H. J. Paris, 1925. 214 pp.

Voretzsch, K. — Einführung in das Studium d. altfrz. Literatur . . . Dritte Auflage. (Sammlung Kurzer Lehrbücher d. rom. Spr. u. Lit. II.) *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1925. xix + 552 pp. 13 M.; geb. 15 M.

Warnke, K. — Vier Lais der Marie de France. Nach der Hs. des British Mus. Harl. 978 mit Einleitung u. Glossar hrsg. v. Karl Warnke. (Sammlung romanischer Uebungstexte. II. Band.) *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1925. xvi + 46 pp. M. 1.60.

Young, C. E.—Anthology of French Lyric Poetry. *Chicago:* Sanborn, 1925. 160 pp.

ITALIAN

Barone, V.—Il pensiero letterario durante il risorgimento. Conferenza tenuta alla scuola allievi ufficiali di complemento di Palermo. *Palermo:* Tip. G. Castiglia. 1924. 29 pp.

Biscottini, U.—Alfredo Oriani pensatore ed artista. *Pisa:* Soc. ed. Nazionale, 1924. 177 pp. L. 7.

Bonsegna, A.—Il petrarchismo di Domenico De Angelis, in Arcadia Arato Alalcomenio. Appunti critici e bibliografici. *Ostuni:* Tip. Ennio, di G. Tamborrino, 1924. 36 pp. L. 4.

Buonarroti, Michelangelo.—Michelangelo poeta: scelta di rime commentate ed illustrate da F. Rizzi, con prefazione di L. Bistolfi. *Milano:* Fratelli Treves, 1924. xxxvii + 365 pp. L. 16.50.

Calosso, U.—L'anarchia di Vittorio. Discorso critico sulla tragedia alfieriana. *Bari:* G. Laterza e figli, 1924. 211 pp. L. 12. (Biblioteca di cultura moderna, no. 123.)

Catanea, P.—Linguaggio greco di Bova. *Reggio Calabria:* Tip. "L'Avvenire," 1924. 12 pp.

Cesareo, G. A.—La vita e l'arte di Giovanni Meli. *Palermo:* R. Sandron, 1924. 285 pp. L. 14. (Biblioteca Sandron di scienze e lettere, no. 103.)

Claudio, L.—La Vergine nella Divina Commedia. *Molfetta:* Libr. ed. T. Spadavecchia, 1924. 104 pp. L. 5.

Di Marzo, E.—La nuova scuola poetica dialettale siciliana. Vol. I. *Palermo:* R. Sandron, 1924. 227 pp. L. 8.

Ferri, A.—La Signora di Monza, con nota di F. Sessler. *Ancona:* Casa ed. Fogola, 1924. vii + 239 pp. L. 10.

Gargallo, T.—Memorie autobiografiche. *Siracusa:* Tip. S. Santoro Gubernale, 1923. xxviii + 757 pp. L. 35. (Opere edite ed inedite, pubblicate da F. Francesco di Castel Lentini. Vol. I.)

Gigante, M.—Due conferenze: il Fedone di Platone, il Principe di Machiavelli. *Roma:* Libr. del Tritone, 1924. 77 pp. L. 5.

Guerrieri Crocetti, C.—Il "Rinaldo" di Torquato Tasso. *Firenze:* A. Vallecchi, 1924. 79 pp. L. 5. (La critica letteraria, no. 4.)

Guicciardini, Ludovico. — Ore di ricreazione, a cura di G. Fabris, con xilografie di P. Parigi. *Roma:* A. F. Formiggini, 1924. xxiii + 148 pp. L. 8. (Classici del ridere, no. 49.)

Inglese D'Amico, V.—I francescani nella Divina Commedia. *Palermo:* R. Sandron, 1924. 35 pp. L. 1.50.

Leopardi, Giacomo.—Prose e poesie. *Sancasciano-Pesa:* Soc. ed. Toscana, 1924. xxxii + 422 pp. L. 5. (Classici italiani e stranieri, no. 4.)

Mari, G.—L'arte dello scrivere, con gli esempi e la pratica dei prosatori nostri contemporanei. *Milano:* U. Hoepli, 1924. xvi + 574 pp. L. 18.

Morico, C.—Solo i morti son vivi. Una religione de' morti nella vita e nella poesia di Giovanni Pascoli. Conferenza. *Arpino:* Soc. tip. Arpinate, 1924. 42 pp. L. 2.

Petrarca, Francesco.—Salmi penitenziali. Traduzione del sac. G. Uberti. Salmi davidici e professione di fede, tradotti nel buon secolo della lingua, a cura del sac. C. Pasetti. *Milano:* Casa ed. Sonzogno, 1924. 90 pp. L. 1. (Biblioteca universale, no. 531.)

Pizzi, Italo (Italo da Parma).—Memorie d'un letterato che non fu ciarlatano. *Torino:* Soc. ed. Internazionale, 1924. 241 pp.

Poeti, I Quattro. La Divina Commedia, di Dante Alighieri; Le Rime, di Francesco Petrarca; L'Orlando Furioso, di Lodovico Ariosto; La Gerusalemme Liberata, di Torquato Tasso. *Firenze:* G. C. Sansoni, 1924. xiv + 114; x + 90; vii + 351; viii + 139 pp. L. 25.

Puzzolo Sigillo, D.—Il sonetto italiano già bello e formato nelle materne viscere di un' antichissima doppia canzone siciliana? *Messina:* Tip. ditta d'Amico, 1924. 27 pp. (Biblioteca della società messinese di storia patria, no. 2.)

Ratti-Leoncini, U.—La lirica di Giovanni Pascoli. *Marina di Carrara:* Tip. C. Pisani, 1924. iv + 74 pp.

Santi, A.—L'ordinamento morale e l'allegoria della Divina Commedia: l'allegoria. *Palermo:* R. Sandron, 1924. 217 pp. L. 11. (Biblioteca Sandron di scienze e lettere, no. 100.)

Sgroi, C.—Percy Bisshe Shelley e un suo interprete italiano. *Noto:* Libr. ed. G. Di Giovanni, 1924. 29 pp.

Silla, G. A.—Vocaboli, detti e proverbi in vernacolo finalese. *Savona:* Tip. Brizio, 1924. 16 pp.

Tilgher, A.—Ricognizioni: profili di scrittori e movimenti spirituali contemporanei italiani. *Roma:* Libr. di Scienze e lettere, 1924. 252 pp. L. 11. (Voci del tempo, serie II.)

Tommaseo, Niccolò.—Pagine scelte, a cura di P. Rost. *Milano:* Facchi, 1924. 157 pp. L. 5. (Collezione di pagine immortali, no. 10.)

Zabughin, V.—Storia del rinascimento cristiano in Italia. *Milano:* Fratelli Treves, 1924. viii + 376 pp. L. 20.

Zunnui Cao, A.—Monografia sull' apostrofe rivolta a Dante e a Virgilio dal mostro simbolo Pluto del VII° canto dell' Inferno. *Viadana (Mantova):* Tip. la Scolastica, 1924. 31 pp. L. 5.

SPANISH

Artigas, M. — Don Luis de Góngora y Argote. Biografía y estudio crítico. *Madrid:* Tip. de la "Revista de Archivos," 1925. 492 pp. 20 ptas. (Obra premiada por la Real Academia Española.)

Asín Palacios, M.—El cordobés Abenhazam, primer historiador de las ideas religiosas. *Madrid:* Maestre, 1924. 72 pp. (Discurso de recepción en la Academia de la Historia.)

Barbagelata, H. D.—Una centuria literaria, 1800-1900. (Poetas y prosistas uruguayos.) *París:* Biblioteca Mundo Latino, 1924.

Barja, C.—Literatura española. Libros y autores modernos. *Madrid:* Sucesores de Rivadeneyra, 1924. 644 pp.

Bell, A. F. G.—Luis de León. A study of the Spanish Renaissance. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1925. 394 pp. $10.00.

Calderón de la Barca, Pedro.—La cena de Baltasar. *Cambridge:* The University Press, 1925. vii + 56 pp. (Cambridge Plain Texts.)

Cejador y Frauca, J.—La verdadera poesía castellana. Historia crítica de la antigua lírica popular. Tomo V. *Madrid:* Tip. de la "Revista de Archivos," 1924. 328 págs. 7.50 ptas.

Cervantes, Miguel de.—Comedia de los tratos de Argel. Mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen hrsg. von L. Pfandl. *Leipzig:* G. Freytag, 1925. 127 pp.

—— Don Quijote de la Mancha. Kritische Ausgabe mit Kommentar, in 5 Bänden, besorgt von A. Hämel. Band I. *Halle (Saale):* Max Niemeyer, 1925. xv + 256 pp. M. 6. (Romanische Bibliothek, 23.)

Depta, M. V.—Pedro Calderón de la Barca. *Leipzig:* Quelle und Meyer, 1925. x + 262 pp.

Farinelli, A.—I Tedeschi nel giudizio degli Spagnuoli sino all' alba del romanticismo. *Genève:* L. S. Olschki, 1924. 58 pp.

Fitzmaurice-Kelly, J. — Geschichte der spanischen Literatur. Übersetzt von E. Vischer, herausgegeben von A. Hämel. *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1925. xv + 654 pp. M. 20. (Sammlung romanischer Elementar- und Handbücher, hrsg. von W. Meyer-Lübke. II. Reihe: Literaturgeschichte.)

Gómez de Baquero, E.—El renacimiento de la novela en el siglo XIX. *Madrid:* Mundo Latino, 1924. 269 pp.

Hämel, A.—Studien zu Lope de Vegas Jugenddramen, nebst chronologischen Verzeichnis der Comedias von Lope de Vega. *Halle:* Max Niemeyer, 1925. vi + 74 pp. (Studien über Amerika und Spanien. Heft I.)

León, Luis de.—Poesías originales. *Cambridge:* The University Press, 1925. vi + 62 pp. (Cambridge Plain Texts.)

Machado, A.—Nuevas canciones. *Madrid:* G. Hernández y G. Sáez, 1924. 4 ptas.

Millares, L. y A.—Léxico de Gran Canaria. *Las Palmas:* Tip. del "Diario," 1924. xiii + 189 pp.

Restori, A.—Il cavaliere di Grazia. *Napoli:* Perrella, 1924. 155 pp. ("Biblioteca Rara," diretta da Achille Pellizzari: terza serie, LVIII-LX.)

Rogerio Sánchez, J.—Textos y Ejercicios para el estudio de la Literatura. Segunda edición. *Madrid:* Imp. de "La Enseñanza," 1925. 415 pp. 10 ptas.

Vega López, C.—La poesía popular de la América española. *Madrid:* J. Pueyo, 1924. 46 pp.

ROMANCE

Aeppli, Fritz.—Die wichtigsten Ausdrücke für das Tanzen in den romanischen Sprachen. (Beihefte z. Zeit. f. rom. Phil., Heft 75.) *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1925. x + 102 pp. M. 6.

Blondheim, D. S. — Les Parlers judéo-romans et la *Vetus latina*. Etude sur les rapports entre les traductions bibliques en langue romane des Juifs au moyen âge et les anciennes versions. *Paris:* E. Champion. 1925. cxxxviii + 247 pp. 60 fr.

Studies by members of the Department of Romance Languages of the U. of Wis. I. *Madison:* 1924. 238 pp.

GENERAL

Brinkmann, Hennig.—Geschichte der Lateinischen Liebesdichtung. *Halle:* Max Niemeyer, 1925.

Collingwood, R. G.—Outlines of a Philosophy of Art. *London:* Humphrey Milford, 1925.

Craigie, W. A.—Easy Readings in Old Icelandic, with Outlines of Grammar and Vocabularies. *Edinburgh:* I. B. Hutchen. 1924. 96 pp. 3 sh.

Jahrbuch für Philologie, hrsg. v. Victor Klemperer und Eugen Lerch. 1. Bd. *München:* Max Hueber, 1925. 480 pp. M. 16.

McNeal, Edgar Holmes.—Modern Europe and its Beginnings. *New York:* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925.

Mirsky, Prince D. S.—Modern Russian Literature. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1925. $1.00.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Bennett, Mrs. Arnold.—Arnold Bennett. *New York:* Adelphi Press, 1925. $2.00.

Borowski, Bruno.—Lautdubletten im Altenglischen. *Halle:* Max Niemeyer, 1925.

Bodley Head Quartos.—Samuel Daniel, A Defense of Ryme; Thomas Campion, Observations in the Art of English Poesie. *New York:* E. P. Dutton & Co., 1925. $1.50.

Bruce, Harold. — William Blake in this World. *London:* Jonathan Cape, 1925. 12sh. 6d.

Carpenter, E. and Barnefield, G. — The Psychology of the Poet Shelley. *New York:* E. P. Dutton & Co., 1925. $2.00.

Chambers, E. K.—Shakespeare: A Survey. *London:* Sidgwick and Jackson, 1925. 7sh. 6d.

Chelli, Maurice.—Le Drame de Massinger. *Paris:* Les Belles Lettres, 1925. Fr. 25.

Crump, G. H.—A Guide to the Study of Shakespeare's Plays. *London:* Harrop, 1925. 2sh.

Gourmont, Remy de.—Deux Poètes de la Nature: Bryant et Emerson. *Paris:* "La Centaine," 1925.

Hebel, J. William. — Michael Drayton: Endimion and Phoebe. Edited. *Boston:* Houghton Mifflin Co., 1925. $2.00.

Kellner. Leon. — Restoring Shakespeare. A critical analysis of the misreadings in Shakespeare's Works. *Leipzig:* B. Tauchnitz, 1925.

Keynes, Geoffrey.—The Writings of William Blake. 3 vols. *London:* Nonesuch Press, 1925. £5. 17sh. 6d.

Legouis, Emile.—Dans les sentiers de la Renaissance anglaise. *Paris:* Les Belles Lettres, 1925. Fr. 7.

Macy, John.—The Story of the World's Literature. *New York:* Boni & Liveright, 1925. $5.00.

Mantle, Burns.—The Best Plays of 1924-1925. *Boston:* Small, Maynard & Co., 1925. $3.00.

Mawer, A. and Shenton, F. M. — The Place-Names of Buckinghamshire. [English Place-Name Society, Vol. II.] *Cambridge:* University Press, 1925.

Merritt, Percival. — Piozzi Marginalia, comprising some extracts from Manuscripts of Hester Lynch Piozzi, and annotations from her Books. *Cambridge:* Harvard University Press, 1925.

Mutschmann, H. — The Secret of John Milton. *Dorpat:* The Author, 1925. 8sh.

Ogg, David.—Johannis Seldeni. Ad Fletam Dissertatio. Reprinted from the edition of 1647. With parallel Translation, Introduction, and Notes. *Cambridge:* University Press, 1925. 20sh.

Pendrill, Charles. — London Life in the Fourteenth Century. *New York:* The Adelphi Co., 1925. $5.00.

Plomer, Henry R.—William Caxton, 1424-1491. *London:* Leonard Parsons, 1925. 4sh. 6d.

—— Wynkyn de Worde and his Contemporaries. *London:* Grafton & Co., 1925.

Pons, Emil.—Le Thème et la Sentiment de La Nature dans la Poésie Anglo-Saxonne. *London:* Humphrey Milford, 1925.

Quayle, T.—Poetic Diction. A Study of Eighteenth-Century Verse. *London:* Methuen & Co., 1925. 7sh. 6d.

Roe, F. C.—Taine et L'Angleterre. *Paris:* Edward Champion, 1923.

Sampson, H. F.—The Language of Poetry. *London:* Heath Cranton, 1925. 3sh. 6d.

Schanck, Nikolaus.—Die socialpolitischen Anschauungen Coleridges und sein Einfluss auf Carlyle. [Bonner Studien zur engl. Philologie, Heft XVI.] *Bonn:* Peter Hanstein, 1924.

Smith, C. Alphonso.—Literary Contrasts. *New York:* Ginn & Co., 1925. $2.36.

Smith, Logan Pearsall.—Words and Idioms. *Boston:* Houghton Mifflin Co., 1925. $2.00.

Stanard, Mary Newton. — Edgar Allan Poe Letters in the Valentine Museum. 328 pp. $15.00.

—— The Dreamer: a Romantic Rendering of the Life of E. A. Poe. *Philadelphia:* J. B. Lippincott Co., 1925. 382 pp. $3.50.

Ten Bensel, E. Van der Ven.—The Character of King Arthur in English Literature. *Amsterdam:* H. J. Paris, 1925.

Trevelyan, R. C.—Thamyris: or, Is There A Future for Poetry? *New York:* E. P. Dutton & Co., 1925. $1.00.

Vendryes, J. — Language: A Linguistic Introduction to History. Translated by Paul Rodin. *New York:* Alfred A. Knopf, 1925. $6.00.

Wallenberg, J. K. — The Vocabulary of Dan Michel's Ayenbite of Inwit. A phonological, morphological, etymological and semasiological, and textual study. *Upsala:* Appelberg, 1923.

Welby, T. E.—Arthur Symons. *London:* A. M. Philpot, 1925. 10sh. 6d.

Wilson, F. P. — Thomas Dekker: Four Birds of Noah's Arke. *Oxford:* Blackwell, 1925. 7s. 6d.

GERMAN

Bolte, Johannes. — Zwei satirische Gedichte von Seb. Franck. [Sitzungsber. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1925, 11]. *Berlin:* de Gruyter, 1925. Pp. 89-114, 4°. M. 1.

Heinertz, N. Otto.—Eine Lautverschiebungstheorie. [Lunds Univ. Årsskrift. N. F. Avd. 1. Bd. 20. Nr. 7.] *Lund:* C. W. K. Gleerup; *Leipzig:* Otto Harrassowitz. 84 pp.

Holmberg, John.—Eine mittelniederfränkische Übertragung des Bestiaire d'Amour, sprachlich untersucht und mit altfranzösischem Paralleltext herausgegeben. [Uppsala Univ. Årsskrift 1925, Filosofi, Språkvetenskap och historisk vetenskaper. 2.] *Uppsala:* A. B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln. xvi + 253 pp., map and facsimile.

Kleiner, Mathilde.—Zur Entwicklung der Futur-Umschreibung werden mit dem Infinitiv. [Univ. of Cal. Publ. in Modern Philol., Vol. 12, No. 1.] *Berkeley:* Univ. Cal. Press, 1925. viii + 101 pp. $1.25.

Kraus, Carl v.—Walther von der Vogelweide als Liebesdichter. Rede. [Münchener Universitätsreden, H. 3.] *München:* M. Hueber, 1925. 16 pp. 50 Pf.

Lehmann, Emil.—Hölderlins Idylle "Emilie vor ihrem Brauttag." [Prager deu. Studien. H. 35.] *Reichenberg i. B.:* F. Kraus, 1925. vi + 54 pp. M. 2.40.

Marcuse, Herbert.—Schiller-Bibliographie. Unter Benutzung d. Trömelschen Schiller-Bibliothek (1865) hrsg. *Berlin:* S. M. Fraenkel, 1925. vi + 135 pp. Bound, M. 9.

Nagel, Hermann. — Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte von Friedrich Hebbels Christusfragment. [Hebbel-Forschungen. Nr. 14.] *Berlin:* B. Behr, 1925. 104 pp. M. 3.25.

Paul, Jean.—Die Briefe Jean Pauls. Hrsg. u. erl. v. Ed. Berend. Bd. 3. 1797 bis 1800. *München:* Georg Müller, 1924. x + 580 pp., 7 plates. M. 6.

Phöbus. Ein Journal für die Kunst. Hrsg. v. H. v. Kleist u. A. H. Müller. 1808. Dresden. [Originalgetreue Wiedergabe = Neudrucke romantischer Seltenheiten. Druck 2.] *München:* Meyer & Jessen, 1924. Bound, M. 30.

Saule, Leo.—Reimwörterbuch zur Nibelunge Nôt nach d. Text von K. Bartsch: Der Nibelunge Nôt (Leipzig 1870) unter Berücks. d. Verb. in W. Braunes: Handschriftenverhältnisse d. Nibelungenliedes (PBB. 25). [Münchener Texte. Ergänzungsreihe. H. 3.] *München:* G. D. W. Callwey, 1925. 61 pp. M. 4.

Sehrt, Edward H.—Vollständiges Wörterbuch zum Heliand und zur altsächsischen Genesis. [Hesperia, Schriften zur germ. Philol. Nr. 14.] *Baltimore:* The Johns Hopkins Press, 1925. viii + 741 pp. Bound, $6.00.

Steinberger, Julius.—Wieland in Mainz. [Stachelschriften, Neuere Reihe, 3.] *Heidelberg:* Weissbach, 1925. 54 pp. M. 3.

Thalmann, Karl.—Reimformenverzeichnis zu den Werken Wolframs von Eschenbach. [Münchener Texte. Erg. Reihe: Reimwörterbücher. H. 4.] *München:* G. D. W. Callwey, 1925. viii + 140 pp. M. 10.

Tröst Einsamkeit, alte u. neue Sagen und Wahrsagungen, Geschichten u. Gedichte. Hrsg. von L. Achim v. Armin. Heidelberg, 1808. [Originalgetreue Wiedergabe = Neudrucke romantischer Seltenheiten, Druck 3.] *München:* Meyer & Jessen, 1924. Bound, M. 18.

FRENCH

Anthologie des Ecrivains morts à la guerre. Vol. II. *Paris:* Malfère, 1924. 786 pp. Fr. 35.

Ashton, H.—Lettres de Mme de La Fayette et de Ménage. *Liverpool:* Univ. Press, 1924. 200 pp. 10sh. 6d.

Berger, Lya.—Les Femmes poètes de la Belgique. *Paris:* Perrin, 1924. Fr. 8.

Bersaucourt, A. de.—Albert Samain et son œuvre. *Paris:* Nouv. revue critique, 1924. 60 pp. Fr. 3.75.

Bordeaux, H. — Portraits d'hommes: Barrès, Bourget, etc. 2 vols. *Paris:* Plon-Nourrit, 1924. Fr. 15.

Brousson, J. J.—Anatole France en pantoufles. *Paris:* Crès, 1924. 378 pp. Fr. 7.50.

Cabinet satyrique, le, éd. originale de 1618, éd. par Fleuret et Perceau. *Paris:* J. Fort, 1924. 2 vols. xviii + 523 + 527 pp. Fr. 50.

Champion, P. — Ronsard et son temps. *Paris:* Champion, 1925. xviii + 508 pp.

—— Ronsard et Jamyn. *Paris:* Champion, 1924. iv + 32 pp. Fr. 50.

Charlier, G. — La Clef de "Clitandre." *Bruxelles:* Acad. roy. de litt. fr., 1924. 21 pp.

Charpentier, J. — Théodore de Banville. *Paris:* Perrin, 1924. Fr. 7.50.

Chinard, G.—Jefferson et les idéologues. *Baltimore:* Johns Hopkins Press, 1925. 296 pp. $2. [Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Lits. and Langs., extra vol. I.]

Clavel, M.—Terres et gens de France. *New York:* Holt, 1924. 347 pp. $4.

Cohen, G.—Le Livre du Régisseur pour le Mystère de la Passion joué à Mons en 1501. *Strasbourg:* Faculté des Lettres, 1925.

—— Ronsard. *Paris:* Boivin, 1924. 2nd ed. 289 pp.

Coleman, A.—Intermediate French. *New York:* Holt, 1924. x + 330 pp.

Crémieux, B.—XXe siècle: Proust, Giraudoux, etc. *Paris:* Nouv. Revue Fr., 1924. Fr. 7.50.

Deffou et Zavie.—Le Groupe de Médan. *Paris:* Crès, 1924. 328 pp. Fr. 7.50.

Delpit, L.—Paris-Théâtre contemporain. *Northampton:* Smith College, 1925. 125 pp. [Smith College Studies in Modern Languages.]

Duhamel, G.—Anthologie de la poésie lyrique de la fin du 15e à la fin du 19e s. *Paris:* Champion, 1924. xxxviii + 531 pp. Fr. 70.

Eringa, S.—La Proposition infinitive simple et subjective dans la prose fr. depuis Malherbe. *Paris:* Champion, 1924. 254 pp. Fr. 20.

Hacker, E. F.—A French grammar. *Columbus:* 1924. 292 pp. $1.75.

Labiche and Martin.—Voyage de M. Perrichon, ed. by R. and H. Fouré. *Chicago:* Winston, 1925. 207 pp.

Lange, M.—Le Comte Arthur de Gobineau. *Strasbourg:* Faculté des Lettres, 1924. xii + 293 pp. Fr. 20.

Le Goff, M.—Anatole France à la Béchellerie (1914-1924). *Paris:* Delteil, 1924. 272 pp. Fr. 7.50.

—— Petite Histoire litt. du dialecte breton de Vannes. *Vannes:* Galles, 1924. 69 pp.

Lyonnet, H.—Les Premières de Jean Racine. *Paris:* Delagrave, 1924. 232 pp. Fr. 7.

Marsan, J.—La Bataille romantique. 2e série: 1830-1857. *Paris:* Hachette, 1924. Fr. 8.

Merrill, R. V.—The Platonism of Joachim Du Bellay. *Chicago:* Univ. Press, 1925. 150 pp.

Rutebeuf.—Le miracle de Théophile, éd. par Grace Frank. *Paris:* Champion, 1925. xiii + 41 pp. [Classiques fr. du moyen age.]

Smith, H. A.—Main Currents of modern French Drama. *New York:* Holt, 1925. xv + 320 pp.

Tastevin, M.—Les héroines de Corneille. *Paris:* Champion, 1924. 251 pp.

Voltaire.—Mérope, ed. by T. E. Oliver. *New York:* Century, 1924. 189 pp. $1.10.

ITALIAN

Altieri, G.—Spiriti e forme nella lirica di Ceccardo [Roccatagliata]. Spunti. Conferenza. *Ferrara:* Industrie grafiche italiane, 1924. 35 pp.

Bartolomeo da Salutio.—Il sacro cigno. Prose e poesie scelte. Prefazione del p. Francesco Sarri. *Firenze:* Libreria ed. Fiorentina, 1924. xix + 218 pp. L. 6.50. (I libri della fede, no. 16.)

De Bartholomaeis, V.—Il teatro abruzzese nel Medio Evo, raccolto da —, pubblicato con la collaborazione del dott. L. Rivera. *Bologna:* N. Zanichelli, 1924. viii + 414 pp. L. 50. (R. Deputazione abruzzese di storia patria.)

—— Le origini della poesia drammatica italiana. *Bologna:* N. Zanichelli, 1923. vii + 543 pp. L. 60. (R. Deputazione abruzzese di storia patria.)

Finzi, M.—I falsari nell' Inferno dantesco. *Firenze:* Leo S. Olschki, 1924. 81 pp. L. 10. (Repr. fr. the "Giornale dantesco.")

Giudici, P.—Il romanzo di A. Fogazzaro. Saggio critico. *Palermo:* R. Sandron, 1924. 150 pp. L. 7.

Giuliotti, D.—Tizzi e fiamme. *Firenze:* A. Vallecchi, 1925. 240 pp. L. 7.

Lami, A.—Impressioni dantesche. *Udine:* Libr. Carducci, 1924. 31 pp. L. 3.50.

Lucca a Giovanni Pascoli (XII ottobre 1924), a cura del Comune. *Lucca:* Tip. Rinascenza italica, 1924. 120 pp. L. 5.

Mazzoni, G.—Abati, soldati, autori, attori del Settecento. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1924. viii + 390 pp. L. 35.

Martini, F. M.—Cronache teatrali, 1923. *Firenze:* G. Barbèra, 1924. 293 pp. L. 16.

Miragoli, Livia.—Il melodramma italiano nell'ottocento. *Roma:* P. Maglione e C. Strini, 1924. 282 pp. L. 14.

Mortier, A.—Ruzzante (1502-1542). Tome premier. *Paris:* J. Peyronnet et Cie., 1925. 286 pp. Fr. 35. (Un dramaturge populaire de la Renaissance italienne.)

Olivero, F.—Studi su poeti e prosatori inglesi. *Torino:* Fratelli Bocca, 1925. 394 pp. L. 45.

Parini, Giuseppe.—Poesie e prose. *Sancasciano-Pesa:* Soc. ed. Toscana, 1924. xv + 472 pp. L. 5. (Biblioteca classica popolare italiana e straniera.)

Phelps, R. S.—The Earlier and Later Forms of Petrarch's Canzoniere. *Chicago:* The University of Chicago Press, 1925. ix + 249 pp. $3.00.

Poliziano, Angelo.—Le più belle pagine, scelte da Angiolo Silvio Novaro. *Milano:* Fratelli Treves, 1925. xii + 258 pp. (Le più belle pagine degli scrittori italiani, no. 23.)

Schiaffini, A. — Toscana dialettale. I. Testi fiorentini del due e de' primi del trecento, con annotazioni linguistiche e glossario, a cura di —. *Firenze:* L'Arte della

stampa, 1924. 80 pp. (Pubblicazioni della r. Accademia della Crusca per la lingua d'Italia. Opere inedite o rare, I.)

Sorrento, L.—Italiani e spagnuoli contro l'egemonia intellettuale francese nel settecento. Dissertazione proemiale. *Milano:* Soc. ed. "Vita e pensiero," 1924. 53 pp. L. 5. (Pubblicazioni della università cattolica del s. Cuore. Serie II [scienze filosofiche], vol. III.)

Viscardi, A.—Francesco Petrarca e il medio evo. *Napoli:* Soc. ed. F. Perrella, 1925. 136 pp. L. 10. (Studi e ritratti: collezione di monografie letterarie, no. 7.)

Wilkins, L. A., and Santelli, C. R.—Beginners' Italian Reader. *New York:* D. C. Heath and Co., 1925. vii + 217 pp. $1.28.

Zabughin, V.—Vergilio nel rinascimento italiano da Dante a Torquato Tasso. Fortuna, studi, imitazioni, traduzioni e parodie, iconografia. Vol. II (Il cinquecento). *Bologna:* N. Zanichelli, 1924. xv + 442 pp. L. 30.

SPANISH

Amezúa y Mayo, A. G. de—Apuntes biográficos de don Jacinto Octavio Picón. *Madrid:* Imp. Ciudad Lineal, 1925. xliv pp.

Baruzi, J.—Saint Jean de la Croix et le problème de l'experience mystique. *Paris:* Lib. F. Alcan, 1924. vii + 790 pp. 40 frs. (Bibliothèque de Philosophie Contemporaine.)

Burell, J.—Artículos. Homenaje de la Prensa de Madrid. *Madrid:* Sucesores de Rivadeneyra, 1925. 341 pp.

Calderón de la Barca, Pedro.—Life's a Dream. Translated for the English Stage by F. Birch and J. B. Trend. *Cambridge:* W. Heffer & Sons, Lted., 1925. xiii + 72 pp.

De Vitis, M. A.—Parnaso Paraguayo. *Barcelona:* Maucci, 1925. 271 pp. 3 ptas.

Fitzmaurice-Kelly, J.—Spanish Bibliography. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1925. 389 pp. $5. (Hispanic Notes and Monographs. Bibliography Series. II.)

Lozoya, Marqués de.—Romances del llano. *Madrid:* Editorial Reus, 1924. 46 pp.

Malaret, A.—Diccionario de Americanismos. (Con un índice de Fauna y Flora). *Mayagüez, P. R.:* R. Carrero, 1925. 641 pp.

Medina Medinilla, Pedro de.—Egloga a la muerte de doña Isabel de Urbina. Ed. y prólogo de Gerardo Diego. *Santander,* Imp. La Atalaya, 1925. 119 pp.

Molina Navarro, G.—Libreros y editores de Madrid durante cincuenta años, 1874-1924. *Madrid:* E. Maestre, 49 pp.

Morel-Fatio, A.—Etudes sur l'Espagne. Quatrième série. *Paris:* E. Champion, 1925. 494 pp. 20 frs.

Palacio Valdés, A.—La hija de Natalia (Ultimos días del Doctor Angélico.) *Madrid:* V. Suárez, 1924. 323 pp. 5 ptas.

Pérez de Guzmán, F.—Generaciones y Semblanzas. Ed. y notas de J. Domínquez Bordona. *Madrid:* La Lectura, 1924. xxxvi + 232 pp. 5 ptas. (Clásicos Castellanos, 61.)

Pérez Galdós, Benito.—Cronicón, 1883-1886. *Madrid:* Sáez Hermanos, 1924. 322 pp. 4 ptas. (Colección de obras inéditas, ordenadas y prologadas por A. Ghiraldo. Vol. VI.)

Ramón y Cajal, S.—Pensamientos escogidos. *Madrid:* 1924. 1.50 ptas. (Cuadernos Literarios.)

Regoyos, D. de—La España negra de Verhaeren. *Madrid:* Imp. Ciudad Lineal, 1924. 115 pp. 1.75 ptas. (Cuadernos Literarios.)

Reyes, A.—Calendario. *Madrid:* Imp. Ciudad Lineal, 1924. 183 pp. 2.25 ptas. (Cuadernos Literarios.)

Salas Barbadillo, A. de—La peregrinación sabia y El sagaz Estacio, marido examinado. Prólogo de F. A. de Icaza. *Madrid:* La Lectura, 1924. xlviii + 303 pp. 5 ptas. (Clásicos Castellanos, 57.)

Trend, J. B.—Luis Milán and the Vihuelistas. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1925. vii + 128 pp. $2.40.

Valle Inclán, Ramón del—Luces de bohemia. *Madrid:* Imp. Cervantina, 1924. 299 pp. 5 ptas. (Obras completas, Vol. XIX.)

GENERAL

Brugmann, Karl.—Die Syntax des einfachen Satzes im Indogermanischen [Beih. zu Indogerm. Forsch. Bd. 43]. *Berlin:* de Gruyter, 1925. vi + 229 pp. M. 12.

Mieses, Mathias.—Die jiddische Sprache. Eine hist. Grammatik des Idioms d. integralen Juden Ost- u. Mitteleuropas. *Berlin:* B. Harz, 1924. xv + 332 pp. Cloth. M. 12.

Ordbog over det Danske Sprog grundlagt af Verner Dahlerup . . . udgivet af det Danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab. Syvende Bind: Gran-Herpaa. *København:* Gyldendalske Boghandel, 1925. 1274 cols., lex. 8°.

Pokorny, Julius.—Altirische Grammatik. *Berlin:* Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1925.

Vossler, Karl.—Geist und Kultur in der Sprache. *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1925. viii + 267 pp. M. 8.